

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, December 17, 1915.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, offered the following prayer:

Good Lord, deliver us from hate and revenge, from sordid hearts and greed, from all ignoble desires and selfish ambitions, from the muckraker and gossip monger, from strife and contention among ourselves, and entangling alliances with other nations, that we may pursue the even tenor of our way and promote the highest interests of our people "with malice toward none and charity for all," doing unto others as we would be done by, that we may hasten the coming of Thy kingdom in the earth. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carr, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution extending the time for filing the report of the joint committee of Congress on the fiscal relations between the District of Columbia and the United States; and

S. 696. An act authorizing the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River at Oil City, Venango County, Pa.

CLERK TO CONTINUE DIGEST OF CLAIMS.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] offers a resolution from the Committee on Accounts, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution (H. Res. 53, Rept. No. 11) providing for the appointment of the clerk to continue Digest of Claims.

Resolved, That, until otherwise provided, the clerk to continue Digest of Claims shall be appointed in the manner now provided by law for the appointment of the clerk of the Committee on War Claims.

SEC. 2. That the salary of the said clerk, at the rate now provided by law, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Amend, in line 7, by striking out the words "until otherwise provided by law" and inserting "during the first session of the Sixty-fourth Congress."

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, there is an amendment in the form of a substitute, the last one.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute: Strike out all of the resolution after the word "Resolved," in the first line, and insert the following in lieu thereof, viz: "That the chairman of the Committee on War Claims be authorized to appoint a clerk to continue Digest of Claims during the first session of the Sixty-fourth Congress, at the salary of \$208.33 per month, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House."

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, on the 4th of March, 1888, there was provided a clerk to make a digest of war claims, and he was specifically named—Mr. Holloway. He continued to perform that duty, and was provided for from year to year by the annual appropriation until June last, when he died.

The Committee on War Claims finds it necessary to have some one to discharge the duties which Mr. Holloway performed. That original provision stated that Mr. Holloway was the person who was to do the work. He was appointed. There was no provision in the original resolution for naming his successor, so that it became necessary in providing for such an officer to provide for it by resolution, and this resolution provides that this person shall be appointed by the chairman of the Committee on War Claims to perform the duties performed by Mr. Holloway, during the first session of the Sixty-fourth Congress, at the salary which Mr. Holloway received.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, the position which Mr. Holloway held under the law as it then existed was a necessary and important position in view of the service to be performed. Mr. Holloway was thoroughly familiar with the work, as his long

experience made him familiar with all the laws relating to war claims, and that committee has jurisdiction of no other. There were a number of acts, one called the Bowman Act and another called the Tucker Act, and different amendatory acts thereto, relating to the payment of war claims, by which the Court of Claims was given jurisdiction of war claims, to pass on the facts and report the bills back to this House. Vast numbers of those claims were reported, and they were considered in bills known as "omnibus bills."

In the Senate there is only one committee having jurisdiction of that subject—the Committee on Claims—having jurisdiction of war claims as well as all other claims. In the House we have two committees, a Committee on War Claims and a Committee on Claims. The result was, while I was a member of the Committee on War Claims for 14 years, that when the omnibus war claims bills went to the Senate they were amended not only by adding claims of like character contained in the House bills, but they also added claims which would naturally be reported in this House from the Committee on Claims. During the Sixty-second Congress an omnibus war claims bill went over to the Senate, and there a large number of claims were added which had not been considered by any committee in this House, not being war claims, and among other amendments there was an amendment offered and passed in the Senate, which I believe was section 4 or 5 of that bill, and the conferees failed to agree.

The gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Morse, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. LEE, and myself, as chairman of the committee, were the House conferees. We could not agree to the Senate amendments in many respects. Among other amendments was one which has now become law, having been made a part of the last war-claims' bill, offered in the Senate by Senator Crawford, by which the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims ceases absolutely on all war claims referred to it under the Tucker and Bowman Acts, and by which the statute of limitations has been revived against all those claims. It appears from the RECORD that when this amendment was offered in the Senate it was objected to by Senator REED, and that seems to have been the only objection that was made to it. Subsequently his objection was withdrawn and the bill was passed with that amendment in it, which is now a part of the law. The omnibus claims bill came to this House with that amendment in it. The bill was laid upon the Speaker's table and did not go to the Committee on War Claims. Unanimous consent was asked to take the bill from the Speaker's table and disagree to all the Senate amendments and ask for a conference. Objection was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] unless an amendment which he proposed was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman is incorrect.

Mr. SIMS. I mean the objection of the gentleman from Illinois—I want to state it correctly.

Mr. MANN. Of course. I would not interrupt the gentleman if I did not know that he wanted to state it correctly.

Mr. SIMS. I know that. The gentleman's suggestion was that we concur in all the Senate amendments except such as were then specified by the gentleman from Illinois. That suggestion was agreed to, and the bill was passed in that way. The House concurred in all the Senate amendments except such as were named by the gentleman from Illinois. Therefore the bill went back to the Senate with the Crawford amendment agreed to by this House. I am satisfied, however, that the chairman of the committee, Mr. GREGG, did not know about it at the time, because the bill was not read in the House, and the effect of that amendment was, as has been decided by the Court of Claims, not only to prevent the further consideration by the Court of Claims of war claims that might be sent to it under the Bowman and Tucker Acts hereafter, but absolutely to dismiss from the court's calendar several thousand claims that had already been sent there by the action of the House and Senate, in a number of which cases the proof had already been taken in that court.

Now, you have practically no use for the War Claims Committee itself unless we are going to repeal that Senate amendment in toto and restore to the dockets of the Court of Claims those claims which have been dismissed by the court as a result of that amendment. That is the only way in which they can be further considered by the court. Not only do we have no use for Mr. Holloway or anybody to take his place, but we have practically no use for the Committee on War Claims itself, unless that amendment be repealed, because I know from long experience that this House is not going to pass war claims that have not been passed upon by the Court of Claims or some other body that gives an impartial consideration and report on the facts and the law.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SIMS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BORLAND. Was it not the intention simply to stop the referring of any more war claims to the Court of Claims, but not to stop the consideration and jurisdiction by the Court of Claims of the claims that had already been referred and in which testimony had been taken?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I can not answer what was the intention of the Senate, except from what appears in the act. This same amendment, word for word, was in a bill that was considered by the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. LEE, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Morse, and myself, the House conferees in the Sixty-second Congress, which we refused to agree to, as well as numerous other amendments, and killed the bill; and if this bill had taken the same course, if the House had not concurred in the Crawford amendment, without even knowing that it was in the bill, several thousand claims would now be on the calendar of the Court of Claims which have been dismissed as the result of that amendment. I believe Senator Crawford knew what he was doing when he drew that amendment, and that it would have the effect which it has had, because I was on the conference committee with the Senator in which there was a controversy over this provision in a former bill.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will give me credit for knowing what I was doing.

Mr. SIMS. I have no doubt that the gentleman not only knew what he was doing, but intended what he was doing. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman from Tennessee was on the War Claims Committee for 14 years.

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Does not the gentleman think it would be the fair thing for us to permit the Court of Claims to proceed with the consideration of claims that Congress has referred to them and in which they have taken testimony, in which the parties have introduced their evidence, and to conclude those cases, and then let the statute of limitations prevent the further consideration of additional claims?

Mr. SIMS. I must admit that it is not only fair, but it is right and proper; but until we pass a bill repealing the Crawford amendment we have practically no use for the Committee on War Claims; and unless we do pass it, war claims, practically, are dead for all time to come. I know that in order to secure an immediate appropriation for the payment of the claims that were then in the omnibus war-claims bill some Senators were willing to dismiss every other claim from the Court of Claims, that Senators themselves in part had sent there, and which the committees of this House had sent there, and I want the country to know what I am satisfied is a fact, that neither the chairman of the Committee on War Claims nor any member of it—though I was not a member of it at that time—knew anything about the amendment. I was a conferee on a former bill which we refused to agree to, and we let the bill die rather than put such a piece of injustice upon those claimants who had filed their claims and employed lawyers and taken their proof. Now these claimants find themselves turned out of doors. In other words, by accepting this amendment we repudiated our own action. I want to call attention to this matter, because I intend to introduce a bill to repeal that part of the Senate amendment and restore the claims to the court in the same condition that they were when they were dismissed. The reason I feel satisfied that the members of the committee, as well as all other Members, did not know of the Crawford amendment is that the bill with the Senate amendments was not read, as it was not necessary to read it in order to disagree to all the Senate amendments and ask for a conference, which was the request made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG], the chairman of the committee, and therefore no neglect of duty by him or any Member of the House can be charged, as it was late at night, and to have read a long bill of several hundred pages would have made it impossible to get the bill into conference at all and would have defeated it most effectually.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG].

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Sims] who has just taken his seat showed to a certain extent the great injustice that was done by what was known as the Crawford amendment. He said that he was going to introduce a bill to remedy the evil and to restore to the Court of Claims those claims which had already been referred by this House, and that were then pending in the court. I wish to inform the House that that bill has already been introduced, and the purpose is to press it and to permit the court to hear and pass upon the cases that were already pending before it, and also the cases that were referred to the Court of Claims in the last Congress without objection from anyone.

Mr. DUPRÉ. How about future cases?

Mr. GREGG. It will take care of all of them. Gentlemen seem to think that there is no use for this employee. I want to explain that the use is greater than it ever was, because if the Court of Claims can not consider these claims, then the Committee on War Claims has got to consider them, and the burden on the committee is increased from ten to fifty fold.

I call attention to another fact showing the necessity for this clerk. There had not been any war-claim bill passed for 12 years until the last Congress passed a bill. That raised the interest throughout the country. The committee has received letters from everywhere—the North, from the West, from the East, and from the South. All of these letters require a courteous and full answer. When Mr. Holloway was there he had been on the committee 39 years, and when these letters of inquiry came all we had to do was to turn them over to him. He had the whole thing in his mind by reason of his long connection with the committee. Now letters of inquiry are coming, the number having increased from five to ten fold. Not having Mr. Holloway to aid us, we have to make a separate independent investigation in each case in order to intelligently and fairly answer these inquiries. The help we have in that committee, with that additional burden placed upon them, is not sufficient to do this work. We have got to have somebody who can make this independent thorough investigation, so that we can give the people a courteous and intelligent answer to their letters of inquiry. Every man who writes to that committee is entitled to a courteous and fair answer and is entitled to the information that he asks for.

As I said, if Mr. Holloway was living, all we would have to do would be to ask him and he could furnish the information. Now every letter of inquiry calls for a separate independent investigation, and to answer courteously and intelligently the letters, as we should, is impossible, because we have not the help to do it.

We only ask for it—the resolution only provides for it—for the first session of this Congress. We want to be prepared to answer all of these letters. If any of your constituents write us a letter about any claim, we want to be prepared to answer it intelligently, courteously, and within a reasonable time, and with the help that we now have we can not do it.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Texas a question in reference to this matter? Has this digest of war claims been kept down to date?

Mr. GREGG. During the last year or two Mr. Holloway's health has been so bad that it has not, and we have quite a lot of that work to bring up.

Mr. MANN. Is it possible for any Member of the House to send to the Committee on War Claims and obtain any information about a war claim?

Mr. GREGG. It is; we furnish pretty full information, but we can not furnish all information; that is, we do not have the time to answer everything, not having the benefit of Mr. Holloway's information and knowledge. It takes a separate and independent investigation.

Mr. MANN. I am glad that the gentleman makes the statement, and I hope his desire may be complied with. I never myself was able to obtain any information from the Committee on War Claims about any claim, either under a Republican or a Democratic administration. I try to keep track of these war claims. I keep the files when they come from the committee and from the Court of Claims.

Mr. GREGG. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. GREGG. I want to say to the gentleman that so far as I know, no request that he has ever made of that committee has been unanswered. I will gladly give him full and courteous information to every inquiry he makes.

Mr. MANN. Oh, that goes without saying. When I wanted to obtain information from the Committee on War Claims I did not go through the form of writing a letter. I had my secretary telephone to the committee, but I never yet got any information from it.

I keep track of the war claims, and I think it is advisable that the committee should have some one who keeps a digest of war claims to date, at least for the benefit of the members of the committee or the chairman of the committee, if not for the benefit of other Members.

Gentlemen have made reference to the action of the last Congress concerning the so-called Crawford amendment. Personally I think the method of referring war claims to the Court of Claims is very objectionable. I would constitute somewhere in the Government an authority which could dispose of these

claims. We refer claims to the Court of Claims for findings of fact and conclusions and recommendations, and frequently it has happened that the Court of Claims has reported that a claim ought not to be paid, but specified the amount involved, and then the claim appeared in an omnibus bill to be paid in conformity with the report of the Committee on Claims. If the Court of Claims renders a judgment we pay it as a matter of course in the deficiency bill, but when the Court of Claims has made a finding it is only the beginning of the controversy. I would constitute somewhere, in some way, an authority which could pass upon these matters and have the judgment of that authority taken as final and the Congress make an appropriation when an appropriation was demanded.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat amused at my friends on the other side of the aisle, the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on War Claims, who rendered great service to the House and the country as chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. SIMS, and the distinguished present chairman, who has rendered great service to the country, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GREGG, who admit that in the last Congress they knew nothing about the matters that they were voting upon.

We had passed an omnibus war-claims bill which we sent to the Senate. That body added several hundred amendments to it. It came over here in the last 24 or possibly 18 hours of the session. I obtained a copy with all the work I had to do in the House of every one of those Senate amendments and examined every one of them. The chairman of the committee said that he did not know what they were. It is strange—more than passing strange—that the leader of the minority, busy on the floor of the House, would have the time and the opportunity and take the occasion to obtain the Senate amendments, examine them, and see whether in his judgment the amendments ought to pass, but that the chairman of the committee, the former chairman of the committee, all the members of the committee on the minority side should have neither the opportunity, the occasion, nor the foresight to find out what the Senate amendments were, and yet propose to agree to them.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that gentlemen sought to send the bill to conference and that I objected. I had been over the amendments. I supposed the gentleman on the other side had been equally careful and that they had examined them. I stated to the gentlemen privately, and afterwards publicly in the House, that as far as I was concerned I was willing that certain Senate amendments should be agreed to if the House would disagree to the other amendments—and I indicated each amendment by number—with the understanding, also previously obtained, that the Senate would ratify our action. Thereupon they agreed to an amendment which they all say is vicious and bad. I do not think it is good faith on the part of the majority to enter into an agreement of that kind and then, the first crack out of the box, seek to repudiate what they agreed to. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. MILLER, a member of the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, the only reason that I rise is to say, speaking for the minority members of the Committee on Accounts, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEATON] and myself, that we were present at the meeting of the Committee on Accounts when this matter was considered. It was the only resolution that was before us that was the cause of considerable discussion, and I might say that it was amended to provide for this clerk only until the end of the present session of Congress rather than for the whole Congress, as the resolution originally was introduced. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG] gave us the same explanation that he has given the House to-day, and it was brought out in the discussion before the committee that the salary of Mr. Holloway is now included in the legislative, judicial, and executive act, which expires on June 30 of next year. The money is already appropriated. This resolution, as will be seen, provides for the payment of this clerk out of the contingent fund of the House until the end of the present session, which, of course, will probably extend beyond June 30 of next year. I only wanted to substantiate what the chairman of the committee has said and the gentleman from Texas has said, namely, that they need this man over there, and only ask for him until the end of the present session. I am speaking for the minority members of the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the gentleman from Tennessee, that the House did a substantial injustice in adopting the Crawford amendment, having the far-reaching

effect of dismissing claims that this House had already referred to the Court of Claims, of which the Court of Claims had taken jurisdiction, in which the claimants had been invited and, in fact, compelled to submit evidence, and in which the examiners of the Government had gone into various portions of the United States to take evidence.

It seems to me that it must have been a matter of inadvertence that at that stage of the proceedings we passed a bill dismissing the claims. I can understand how there may be a time when the statute of limitations ought to run against the beginning of new proceedings, but the faith of the United States ought to be pledged to pay the claims that we have submitted to the Court of Claims.

I agree in part with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that there ought to be in the Court of Claims power to adjudicate these claims, and not to make a mere recommendation and finding of facts which can be acted upon or not by this Congress. There ought to be a final judgment rendered against the United States in the case of such claims as are found just. It seems to me it is more dignified, proper, and just for the United States to submit to a tribunal of justice the validity of a claim and have the claimant prove by his evidence the existence of the right, and pay the debt, than it is to have that kind of claim established before a committee. The difficulty of having this thing thrown back again into a committee of Congress is this: Some gentleman presents a claim which he says his father suffered, possibly during the Civil War, and he thinks the claim is for a thousand dollars or \$5,000 or \$10,000. He honestly thinks this, but when he comes to submit his claim to the arbitrament of a court of justice he finds it amounts to \$250 or \$750 or \$923, or some such sum. We all know that a man sues for \$5,000 and occasionally gets only \$1. The Federal Government is at the mercy of that kind of evidence before its Committee on Claims, but a court of justice has its rules of evidence, by which it can test the validity of a claim. I will undertake to say, without fear of dispute, that it is almost as easy to get before a committee of Congress and get favorable consideration of a \$5,000 claim as it is of a \$5 claim. So that there is no way of testing the merits of a claim by the amount demanded. It depends largely on the diligence of a man who is presenting the claim. By all means, we ought to restore the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims, and we ought to make it finally conclusive, and when those claims are adjudicated against the United States we ought to pay them.

The difficulty was that in the Sixty-second Congress we passed an omnibus claims bill, as I recollect. It went to another body, and there a number of claims were added in the nature of the French spoliation claims. This House would not submit to the payment of those French spoliation claims, and the whole bill failed, regardless of the merits of claims that had been adjudicated by the Court of Claims. In the Sixty-third Congress we did the same thing. Gentlemen with great industry and fidelity got up their claims bill and it went to the other body, and there some claims were annexed that were for overtime, as I recall, of certain officers of the Army, which had not been adjudicated anywhere. This House was not willing to submit to the payment of those claims, which had not been before a court of justice; and, in order to get the bill through and finally pay some very deserving claimants who had had their claims adjudicated, we finally passed the bill after eliminating all the objectionable amendments that we could.

Now, we did not eliminate this particular Crawford amendment which was objectionable. We might have done so, and possibly we should have done so, even at the risk of the failure of the bill. But those claims against the United States ought to have been paid and were honestly paid by that bill and should have been disposed of. The bills which have been referred by this House to the Court of Claims and have been in the process of adjudication there should be completed, and, when completed, they should be finally paid.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG].

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I can not sit quietly by and hear the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Illinois state that we did not know what was in that bill. I want to say to you that we did know and we acted advisedly. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], who was the ranking member, and would have been one of the conferees on the committee, and I went to the Senate. We saw the Senate members who would have been conferees, and we discussed this very provision, and we were informed by the Senate members that the bill would be defeated if we did not accept that amendment. Remember, that that Congress had to adjourn on the 4th of March. This was between 12 and 1 o'clock of the night of the 3d of March, and we had no time. We were assured by the

Senators that Mr. Crawford would filibuster against the bill and defeat it. The time was so short that we knew he could do it without any trouble, and so we accepted it advisedly, relying upon the fairness of this House to repeal it at this session of Congress.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I stated I did not think the gentleman knew, by reason of the fact that it was not read in the House.

Mr. GREGG. We read it.

Mr. SIMS. I stand corrected. I did not know the gentleman had done that. I know that I did not know anything about it.

Mr. GREGG. Here is the position, gentlemen. There were 1,100 claims in that bill against which nobody had any objection. They had been passed upon by the Court of Claims, the amounts had been adjudicated, and the loyalty of the claimants had been established by the court. Those people had been trying for 50 years to get the money that the Government fairly owed them; and the prospects were that if we did not agree to that amendment and let that bill pass those 1,100 claimants would have been denied their just demands against this Government. And knowing that and realizing that—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREGG (continuing). We agreed knowingly to that amendment rather than to make those 1,100 people suffer any longer.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district which is very much interested in the matter under discussion. During my service in this House I have sent 40 or 50 war claims to the Court of Claims for investigation and report. The claimants employed their attorneys. They have spent some time and not a little money procuring evidence to be submitted to the court, and on the adjournment of the last Congress I ascertained for the first time that this House had agreed to an amendment offered in the Senate practically throwing out of that court these identical claims. None of us had any information in this House of this proposed plan except the members of the War Claims Committee who were dealing with the Senate amendment. We were in absolute ignorance of it. There never was a statement made on the floor of the House or an intimation that we were going to commit ourselves to this unjust and unfair action which is a denial of justice to claimants whose cases we have submitted to a court in order that that court might submit a finding to this House. When I returned home I had to admit that Congress had passed such a bill without the knowledge on the part of the Members of this House, except the members of the Committee on War Claims and perhaps a half dozen others, of what they were doing in the closing hours of that session.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen of the House will observe there has been no objection to the passage of this resolution; that this discussion has been on another subject altogether. I think there can be no question about the merit of the resolution. Mr. Holloway, if he had lived, would have drawn the salary during the vacation. No one has drawn any salary for this service, although it was provided for by law since July last. If Mr. Holloway had lived there would have been no necessity for any resolution of any kind and he would have drawn his salary to the 30th day of June, 1916. I ask for the question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LLOYD. Now, the substitute.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute.

The substitute was agreed to.

The resolution as amended by the substitute was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS ALLEGHENY RIVER, OIL CITY, PA.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there lies on the Speaker's table a bill (S. 696) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Allegheny River at Oil City, Pa. It passed the Senate on the 16th. A similar bill has been prepared by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I ask to have the Senate bill taken from the Speaker's table and passed.

Mr. MANN. It does not require unanimous consent. It is automatic.

Mr. ADAMSON. It is correct.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the bill (S. 696), which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 696) authorizing the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River at Oil City, Venango County, Pa.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., a railroad corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of

Pennsylvania, be, and it is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Allegheny River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in Oil City, county of Venango, and State of Pennsylvania, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House bill of a similar tenor will be ordered to lie on the table.

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House joint resolution No. 60 and consider the Senate amendment in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House joint resolution No. 60, with a Senate amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 60) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, with Senate amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, let the Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, that is not the question, although I have no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move to agree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. MANN. Has the request already been granted to consider it in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asked that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from New York yield to me a little time?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I shall make a statement explaining it first.

Mr. Speaker, some time about the 1st of July a bomb was exploded at the Senate end of the Capitol, doing some damage to the building. The situation was such that the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate took up with the Superintendent of the Capitol the question of providing in some way for additional watch service for the Capitol Building. The Superintendent of the Capitol arranged to carry on certain pay rolls, out of certain appropriations under his charge, 16 additional watchmen, at the compensation of \$60 per month. He did it upon condition that the captain of the Capitol police should personally select the men, and after they had been selected they were sent to the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, in order that he might be satisfied that they were physically and otherwise qualified for the police duties to which they were to be assigned.

The men were appointed about the 5th of July and carried on the appropriations under the control of the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds until the 15th of December. The total expenditure was \$5,250. One-third of the sum was charged to the appropriation for the maintenance and repair of the Capitol Building, one-third to the maintenance of the House Office Building, and one-third to the maintenance of the Senate Office Building. The condition of the appropriations did not permit the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds to have any additional expense for this purpose charged against his appropriations after the 15th of December. I am informed that the men originally selected are still performing the service.

There are provided by the legislative act 47 privates, 3 lieutenants, and 1 captain of police. The privates receive \$1,050 per annum, and they, with the 16 additional privates, at \$720 a year, making a total of 67 employees, are now performing the duty of policing the Capitol and the two office buildings.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will wait until I finish a statement of what has been done, I shall be glad to yield. I wish to have a complete statement.

In the Sixty-second Congress there were dropped from the Capitol police force 1 lieutenant, at \$1,200, and 34 privates, at \$1,050 each; 35 employees, at a total annual compensation of \$36,900. In the first session of the Sixty-third Congress there were added 1 lieutenant, at \$1,200, and 14 privates, at \$1,050 each, or 15 employees, at the total annual compensation of \$15,900. The net reduction from the beginning of the Sixty-second Congress was 20 employees, with a total annual compensation of \$21,000.

The Senate added in the pending bill 16 employees, at \$720 each, which leaves a net reduction from the Sixty-second Congress of 4 employees, with a total compensation of \$9,480.

I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I do not know whether the gentleman can give the information I was seeking. How many of these police are on duty at the same time? They are in three shifts, are they, of eight hours?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; three shifts.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. You say there are 40 or 50 of them?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Fifty-one, including both the office buildings.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Can the gentleman tell how many of them were on duty at the time this bomb was exploded?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I have not the information.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. The gentleman would not know whether there was one or anyone?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have no information on the question. If they were equally divided in three shifts, it would give 16 privates on each shift to police the House Office Building and the Capitol and the Senate Office Building.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. How many?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Sixteen for each shift, if the number of men were equally divided in three shifts. That would make 16 men, if that is the way the division is made. I am not certain, but I believe there are more on duty during the day, when more persons are in the Capitol, but I am not positive about it.

Mr. Speaker, the Sergeant at Arms of the two Houses, in view of what happened, are of the opinion that it is highly important that these additional men should be employed for the balance of the fiscal year. If any accident should occur and the Congress denied to those officials the additional help that they insist is essential properly to police the Capitol Building, they would justify themselves from liability on the ground that the Congress had declined to furnish the force necessary to enable them to do the work. If we give them the force which they say is required properly to police the Capitol Building, then we can hold those in charge of the work rigorously to account in the event of any untoward accident. For that reason I submit the motion to agree to the Senate amendment, in order to test the wish of the House regarding the matter.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it is very likely that we need the additional Capitol police. I do not know whether the gentlemen who have already been employed by the Superintendent of the Capitol are to fill these places or not. The police are appointed, I believe, by the Sergeant at Arms, one-half from the House and one-half from the Senate, and if we add to the number of Capitol policemen, probably the desire for pie will result in the appointment of new men, unless the patronage committee on the other side have already selected the men who were employed last summer.

Four years ago our Democratic friends, having obtained a majority in the House, came in with great professions of economy. They held a caucus and decided to abolish a lot of the places in the House, most of which have since been restored. Among the other places they proposed to abolish were quite a number of the Capitol police. Under the leadership of that distinguished and able Member of the House, Mr. Palmer, of Pennsylvania, they determined to abolish the number of the Capitol police and other offices. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Palmer, has since been rewarded by the administration, which appreciated his proper efforts for economy, though, I think, they were never fully appreciated even on that side of the House. [Laughter.] But right after the Democratic caucus the House considered and passed this resolution:

That the provisions in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation acts approved June 17, 1910, and March 4, 1911, making appropriations for the Capitol police, are hereby amended by reducing the number of lieutenants from 3 to 2, by reducing the number

of privates from 67 to 33, and by reducing the total appropriation for the Capitol police to such sums as may be necessary.

That was the result of caucus action on the Democratic side of the House. Mr. Roddenberry, of Georgia, had charge of the resolution reported from the Committee on Accounts, and on May 26, 1911, he said:

Mr. Speaker, this resolution completes, or is designed to complete, the caucus action of the majority on the 1st of April. The caucus action and the report of the committee favored the abolition of 34 private policemen of the Capitol force and 1 lieutenant of the Capitol police, and the joint resolution seeks to carry into effect this resolution by reducing the number of lieutenants from 3 to 2 and by reducing the number of privates from 67 to 33, and we submit this resolution for the purpose of executing this mandate of the caucus.

Now it is proposed, by unanimous consent, with no Member on the Democratic side objecting—and any one of them could have stopped this—to override the action of the Democratic caucus. When they took this action four years ago they advertised all over the country, "Here we show you our economy. Here are some Republican policemen on the force, and we propose to discharge them."

We told the Democrats at the time that they would in the end, when they learned more, increase the police force and restore those various offices which they were then abolishing. Now it is proposed to do it, not by a contest in the House, but by unanimous consent. The only real economist that the House ever had on the Democratic side—barring the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]—was Mr. Palmer, of Pennsylvania; and his constituents having dispensed with his services, there is nobody left over there to speak for economy. [Laughter.] No one objects to this "gross extravagance," as you described it four years ago, and I do not wonder. Since that time the country has learned that, whatever else may be expected or received from Democratic control, economy never will be.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois is in error. This amendment is not to be agreed to by unanimous consent. It will be agreed to, if at all, by the House upon a vote. I expect the gentleman from Illinois and quite a number of other gentlemen on that side of the House will vote to adopt the Senate amendment.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Did not the gentleman bring it before the House by unanimous consent?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I brought it before the House by unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. Could not anyone have prevented it by objecting?

Mr. FITZGERALD. He could have prevented its consideration to-day, but that would simply have delayed it until to-morrow, when the committee could have reported it.

Mr. MANN. But when nobody objects, that shows that there is no objection to it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is a particular reason for it. No one on this side of the House will object to a resolution at this time increasing the force of the Capitol police. There are so many more Republicans in this Congress than in the last one that more police are necessary around the Capitol. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Then you had better increase the number for the next Congress. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. In the next Congress there will be so few Republicans upon that side that we can then dispense with a large number of the Capitol police; so that it is very apparent to everyone in the House that no one will object to the consideration of the resolution.

The fact is that everyone is familiar with existing conditions, and the responsibility is upon the House itself to determine whether it is the part of wisdom at this time to provide these 16 additional men to police these three buildings from now until the 30th of June. If they be continued it will give 67 men to do all of the watch and police service in the two office buildings and the Capitol during the time Congress is in session. As I am somewhat solicitous for my own welfare, I intend to vote for the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. MANN. In view of the statement of the gentleman that they were increasing the number of Capitol police because of the increased number on the Republican side, I should like to ask the gentleman, as we are going to have a new Member on the Republican side in the person of Mr. Hicks when next we meet, the court of appeals of his State having decided that Mr. Hicks is elected, whether the gentleman from New York does not want to increase the number of the Capitol police beyond that now proposed?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, Mr. Speaker, if every time a Republican Member is added to the membership on that side of the House it becomes necessary to add four or five policemen to the Capitol police force, I will not be the one to stand in the way of the proper policing of the Capitol; and if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will give me his personal assurance at this time that the fact that the gentleman from the first district of New York, who will receive a certificate more or less permanent, and will take his seat on that side of the House, will necessitate a further addition to the Capitol police force, I shall be glad to modify the motion which I have offered, and to offer one to agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment increasing the police force to such a number as the gentleman from Illinois may think will be adequate.

Mr. MANN. I will give the gentleman the assurance that when we meet again we will have one increase of Members on this side of the House and not on that side.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would not take that unctio to my soul, because his term on that side of the House may not be of sufficient duration to give much joy to the gentleman from Illinois and his colleagues, from what I have been informed are the facts in the case.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt the gentleman from New York hastily says that he is willing to override the decision of the Supreme Court in New York, the decision of the appellate division of the Supreme Court in New York, and the decision of the court of appeals in New York; but I imagine that there will be some Members on the majority side of the House who will pay some attention to the decisions of the courts in the gentleman's own State, although he is not permitted to make it. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman need not worry that the decisions of the courts of the State of New York will not be properly honored in this House. The only thing decided by the courts in the State, so far as the facts are concerned, is that upon certain facts as presented a Republican candidate was entitled to have denied an application to stay further the issuance of a certificate of election. The difference in the vote as reported thus far is three. The Democratic candidate has been struggling ever since the congressional election to have counted in the courts of the State the ballots that were cast at the election, but his attempts to have them counted in a judicial tribunal has been resisted at every stage by his Republican opponent.

What I have to say is this: That when these ballot boxes are opened and the ballots are counted, whichever way an honest and impartial review of them will show the result to be, this side of the House will acquiesce in it. It will not be like those early days which I experienced in this House, when all that was necessary for a man to do was to come to this Chamber claiming a seat on the Republican side and submit a contest and be assured of a seat. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

However, we will settle the election case some other time. I may add that the fact that I was willing to assume a position where I should be free to criticize decisions of the courts of my State perhaps has taken away from me some of the awe with which the gentleman from Illinois looks upon those distinguished tribunals.

Mr. MANN. I do not propose to discuss the election case now.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will pardon me, I do not wish or intend what I say to be construed as meaning that this side of the House has any intention, in any way, of doing an act that will not be strictly in accordance with the rights of the contestants.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I have been long enough in the House and have known the gentleman from New York long enough to distinguish between his serious remarks and his facetious partisan remarks, and I never take them seriously. I made a facetious reference to the gentleman from New York a moment ago showing that I had knowledge that he had been defeated for election as judge in the State of New York. I think that his election to any position outside of this body would have been a distinct loss, not only to this body but to the country at large. [Applause.] If he had been elected judge, I would not think that he should be judged by some of his remarks this morning on election cases, because he would have made an able, impartial judge, as good as any who ever had sat upon the bench. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is such compliments as that that made my campaign very embarrassing and instructive. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The question was taken, and the Senate amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate amendment was agreed to was laid on the table.

REPORT OF THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 425).

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the report of the Industrial Commission. It is a very lengthy document and, unless there is some special reason for reading it, it will be referred to the Committee on Labor. [After a pause.] The Chair refers it to the Committee on Labor and orders it printed.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion. The Clerk read as follows:

That of the report of the United States Commission on Industrial Relations, including all the testimony taken at its hearings, 10,000 additional copies be printed, bound, and distributed in the usual manner through the folding rooms of the House and Senate, and that of the final report of the said commission 200,000 additional copies be printed and bound and likewise distributed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this a resolution which requires unanimous consent? It is not privileged under the rule.

Mr. LEWIS. It is relevant to that very subject.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this is not a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to hear any gentleman on the point of order, which seems never to have been settled since the rules of the House have been changed. In the ordinary course of business the reports are referred by the Speaker and ordered printed or not, as the case may be; that is done practically by unanimous consent. This is not a committee of the House, not even a commission of the House. It was a separate and independent commission, and the Chair is very much in doubt as to what his own procedure ought to be in it.

Mr. BARNHART. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARNHART. It is an established rule of the House, in any event, as I understand it, that any request for printing coming before the Congress must be accompanied by an estimate of costs of the same, together with a showing of the amount appropriated for printing and the amount already expended. Am I right about that?

Mr. LEWIS. We have the estimate here ready to submit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is correct.

Mr. LEWIS. I would like to be heard, Mr. Speaker, on this.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear all gentlemen. The Chair thinks the motion of the gentleman from Maryland is a privileged motion. What the gentleman from Maryland is doing, or ought to be doing, at present is asking for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short statement.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I desire to make a statement myself. As to whether additional copies of this report should be printed I do not wish to express any opinion at this time. I do not know. The Industrial Commission had, all told, if I recollect correctly, an appropriation of \$450,000, and in the last appropriation of \$100,000 made for the commission it was provided that the commission should complete its work by a certain date and should do all of its printing, including the printing of its final report, with the funds that had been made available. Whether additional copies of the report or of some things that have not been printed should be printed, I am not in a position to say, because I do not know; but I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, in view of what I do know about what happened when the appropriation was made, that the printing be done and that the final report should be paid for out of that appropriation; that at least some committee of the House having proper jurisdiction should report the resolution providing for any additional printing. Under the rule all resolutions excepting certain ones of a privileged character can be introduced only through the basket and are referred to the appropriate committees. There is no provision in the rules making privileged a resolution to print copies of any report for distribution. Either the objection that it is not in order or a demand for the regular order prevents consideration. The importance of the matter is this, Mr. Speaker. Whatever is printed now is charged against the congressional allotment for printing. A few years ago an investigation disclosed that there was great abuse in the sending to Congress of all sorts of reports and documents to be printed and charged against the congressional allotments which should have been paid for out

of specific appropriations made for printing for various public services of the Government.

One law to which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] has referred requires all orders for printing to contain certain detailed information regarding the cost of the printing of the document, and such information is usually included in the reports of the Committee on Printing, so that the House, with information of the character of document to be printed, could determine whether it was wise to expend the sum required for any particular document. It seems to me that this resolution provides for an extraordinary number of copies of some portion of the proceedings—some two hundred thousand copies. My recollection is that outside of the edition of the horse book, which at various times is provided for distribution by Congress, there never has been an authorization by Congress for the printing of such a large edition of any document; and I doubt very much whether any considerable portion of the 200,000 copies would ever be read. I believe this matter should be considered by the Committee on Printing and that that committee should report a resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the reports which have already been printed or of some portion of the proceedings which have not been printed, with a detailed statement required by the rule as to the cost of printing, and a recommendation of what should be done. For that reason I make the point of order, because if this other practice be followed, that every time a report is transmitted here from elsewhere, the House should, without the information it should have, adopt resolutions providing for an extraordinary number of copies, it would be absolutely impossible ever to gauge the amount of money that would be required for the congressional printing.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I recall it was said that there was a commission in a former Congress which had taken much of evidence and much of communication, and that the report and the accompanying documents, exhibits, and so forth, would make two carloads. I do not know as to this report, as to how extensive it is, but I understand the gentleman thinks it ought to be referred to the proper committee before the report of the exhibits are printed, or, at least before the exhibits, if they be enormous, of which I have no knowledge, should be printed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a very large volume of matter. I have some requests for copies of the report, and I hope that some provision will be made for printing copies of the report, and if it be deemed advisable that some provision be made for printing the testimony. I do not know whether it is desirable to do so; I did not follow the work of the commission sufficiently to tell. But I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is unwise to provide for the printing in this way. Rule 22 provides for the manner in which petitions, memorials, resolutions, and bills of all kinds shall be introduced. The only resolutions or bills or motions that can be introduced otherwise are motions that are privileged. This resolution to print can not get before the House except by unanimous consent. There is no rule by which it can come before the House in any other way, unless reported from the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] on the point of order as to whether this resolution which he offers is privileged. That is the only question before the House now.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I understand the fact to be that the Speaker in his reference of the matter has ordered it to be printed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has withdrawn that part of it.

Mr. LEWIS. That question is raised with the other. With reference to the gentleman's point of order, to which a very small portion of his remarks, as usual, were devoted, I wish to say that I do not think the matter before the House is in the character of a resolution at all. A resolution would be joint or concurrent in character and would involve the joint action, therefore, of Congress. This is in the nature of a motion that is relevant to and is acted upon while the matter is in passage before the House. It is in the nature of a qualification of the reference of the subject matter by the Speaker himself to the Committee on Labor. It is therefore germane, and an element in the reference itself, and does not take the character of a joint or concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. How does the gentleman make it out that it is a privileged motion?

Mr. LEWIS. I think it is a privileged motion, as it merely qualifies the action of the Speaker himself in making the reference, which is in order.

The SPEAKER. The printing and reference are two separate propositions.

Mr. LEWIS. With all respect, the declaration that both propositions involve but one matter, that is an argument that amounts only to assertion. The practice of the House has been, I submit, to dispose of both as one matter.

The SPEAKER. But the distinction the gentleman fails to make is this: Executive communications that come over here are directed to the Speaker, and they are disposed of offhand; they are just referred. Everyone has heard that done time and again.

This is a report from a commission and it is addressed to the House. Now, query: Can any gentleman who wants printing done at any time offer a resolution and claim that it is privileged? It is a sort of new question since the rules have been changed.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I ask attention to the rule which, I think, is directly applicable to the question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] has the floor. If he desires to yield, the gentleman may do so.

Mr. LEWIS. I would like to get the gentleman's reference to the rule.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the rule of the House that is directly applicable is Rule XI, clause 51, which says:

All proposed legislation or orders touching printing shall be referred to the Joint Committee on Printing on the part of the House.

This certainly is an order providing for printing, and that rule is especially applicable to the situation at hand, and it should be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. I will.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, if we would proceed in this way it will certainly be necessary to first repeal the printing law. I quote from an extract from the printing laws, Statutes at Large, page 1012, as follows:

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by existing law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof.

And paragraph 2 of that section says:

Resolutions to print extra copies, when presented in either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman from Indiana a question?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. Is that law lived up to? Does the Public Printer pay any attention to it whatever?

Mr. BARNHART. He ought to pay attention to it.

Mr. MANN. But, does he? The gentleman is chairman of the committee, and knows.

Mr. BARNHART. Ordinarily, yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the Public Printer ever refuse to print documents of either House of Congress?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman from Maryland yield?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I would like to state, gentlemen, the House did violate that law on Wednesday of this week—

Mr. MANN. They do it every day.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Because they did order printing done by unanimous consent. It seems to me that every Member of this House knows there is an urgent demand from the laboring people of this country for the printing of this report.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. And farmers, too.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. And farmers, too, as suggested by my friend from Texas [Mr. DAVIS]. And is it true that these objections are only raised when this matter is wanted by the great masses of the people? I will say to you that this will be printed. You may delay it if you desire, but this report is going to be printed. The people are not going to be denied such an important report as this when there is such a great demand for it.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman from Maryland permit?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, I would like to call the attention of the House to this fact: I am not saying that I am opposed to the printing of this report, but before it is peremptorily ordered we ought to know something about existing conditions.

As stated by the gentleman from New York, this commission was given an appropriation of \$450,000 to conduct this work. The sundry civil bill of 1915 provided an appropriation of \$100,000 to be available for necessary printing, including the final report of this commission.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. BARNHART. I want to answer the gentleman's question, and then I will yield.

Mr. KEATING. But from that point of view—

Mr. BARNHART. I wish to finish my statement. The probability is that the commission, as a good many other commissions have done, and which is not infrequently done by departments, has exceeded its financial authority. And then it comes to the Congress and asks by a resolution calling for unanimous consent to be given this appropriation.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BARNHART. No. I want to answer the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The commission says it printed 10,000 copies of its final report. Two copies of each were allotted to each Member of Congress. That is a total of 25 copies to each congressional district. I wonder how many of you Members of the House have written to the commission and been advised that they have no copies for distribution? Ten thousand copies were printed, and where are they?

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a question of much importance, involving, as it will, the expenditure of, at the least calculation, \$100,000; that some committee of the House—and, I assure you, I do not want the duty to devolve upon me—should make an investigation and see what the Industrial Commission did with this \$100,000 which was given, as I am informed, for its printing. And until that has been done, any Member of the House offering a protest against a full investigation of the matter is certainly not within the bounds of proper precedent; but it is his duty to do so in behalf of the welfare of the people, who want these reports. There ought to be something in that resolution providing for the distribution of these reports; it does not carry a word of that kind; and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the point of order ought to be sustained and that the matter ought to come up in the regular way. If it comes to the Committee on Printing, the gentleman from Maryland may be assured that he will be given the largest and most impartial hearing possible, so far as the chairman of the committee is concerned.

Mr. LEWIS and Mr. KEATING rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] has the floor on the point of order, and nobody has touched the point of order in the last 30 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] is recognized.

Mr. KEATING. If the Speaker will bear with me for just a moment, I desire to reply to the statement of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART]. Anybody who knows the gentleman from Indiana knows that he would not misrepresent any individual or any commission, and especially a commission appointed by the Government; and yet unfortunately in his quotation he has done the Commission on Industrial Relations a grave injustice, and I am sure that when I call the facts to the attention of the gentleman he will be the very first to make a correction.

He has stated to this House that in the sundy civil appropriation bill \$100,000 was set aside for the specific purpose, as he quoted it, of providing for "all necessary printing, including the final report of the commission"; but the gentleman did not quote the entire provision. The memorandum prepared by some one and submitted to the gentleman, upon which he based this statement, is incorrect, because this is what the \$100,000 was appropriated for. Permit me to quote from the sundy civil bill as it passed the House:

For completing the inquiries and investigations authorized by the act of August 23, 1912, entitled "An act to create a Commission on Industrial Relations" and to provide the expenses of such inquiries and investigations as are enumerated in section 2 of said act and for all necessary printing, including the final report of the commission, \$100,000, to be immediately available.

The commission so expended the money. The commission conducted the investigations just as it told the Committee on Appropriations it would conduct the investigations, and an examination of the hearings, which contain a statement by Chairman Walsh of exactly what he intended to do with the \$100,000, or, rather, with the \$140,000 that he requested, will reveal the fact that he never intimated that he intended to print the evidence with this money. He carried out his exact contract and his instructions under this appropriation bill. He did pay for the necessary printing for the commission and he did print the final report of the commission, and 10,000 copies have been made available. Those are the facts.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not going to hear anybody arguing the merits of the case. If the gentleman from Mary-

land [Mr. LEWIS] has anything to say about this point of order, the Chair will be glad to hear it.

Mr. LEWIS. I have one further suggestion to offer that may bear upon it. The joint resolution itself, constituting the Industrial Commission, reading from section 3, provides that—

Said commission may report to Congress its findings and recommendations and submit the testimony taken from time to time, and shall make its final report, accompanied by the testimony not previously submitted.

The SPEAKER. Now, that has been done.

Mr. LEWIS. That has been done on their part, but it seems to me the purpose and implication in that clause clearly requires a printing, because, practically speaking, their report and the testimony can not be submitted to this or any other human body unless it is printed. That is a physical fact, and however astute the economist of the House, he can not meet it with an answer. Those reports can not be intelligibly submitted to the Congress except in print, therefore the implication of existing law is that they shall be printed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to inquire of the gentleman why he makes that statement that it can not be printed. Information came to the Speaker as to the bulk of this report and the evidence, and inquiry was made as to what to do with it, and somebody suggested that it be brought in here. There was not room enough in the well of the House for it, and the Chair ordered it not brought in. It is out in the lobby, and if anybody wants to inspect it, he can go out there and see it. [Laughter.]

Now, the only question is whether or not this resolution which the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] offers here is a privileged resolution. If it is, we will consider it here now. If it is not, you can not consider except by unanimous consent; and while this thing is a sort of big thing in itself, that is not the largest part of it. It sets a precedent for what shall be done about printing matters hereafter.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that the argument presented is a sound as well as a sincere argument. It is true, perhaps, that in a sense it may be said that the report of the testimony is submitted when it is placed in the custody of the Speaker, but it is not actually presented to the Congress. The Speaker is only the technical conduit through which it may be submitted to the Congress. The actual submission to a Congress that operates through its brains, and not through technical inference, requires that it be printed that it can actually be considered by the Members of this House.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. LEWIS. I do.

Mr. MANN. Does the law require that the commission shall submit this to Congress?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Then, if the gentleman's argument is correct, it is the duty of the commission to print it.

Mr. LEWIS. They have tried to submit it to the Congress, and they have put it in the conduit through which all reports must be submitted to the Congress.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman states that it is printed, his argument falls to the ground.

Mr. LEWIS. The testimony is not printed.

Mr. MANN. If they have submitted the testimony as the law requires the submission of the testimony it must be printed, and it is not our duty to submit it to Congress.

Mr. LEWIS. I think the gentleman will give greater aid to this discussion by endeavoring to understand the point I am making.

Mr. MANN. I did understand it, and I exploded it. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEWIS. The gentleman exploded himself, but not the point. [Laughter.] Now, I submit to anyone in this House whether a matter of this kind, containing 7,000 pages of testimony, can be submitted to the understanding of this House without printing. If that inference be a sound inference, then there is an existing law upon which the Speaker's original ruling in this matter automatically ordering it printed may be sustained, and under these circumstances I think the first ruling of the Speaker ordering it printed should be sustained.

I would like, in connection with my remarks, to submit a letter from Prof. Manly—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say that he has not had the remotest idea of ordering the testimony printed, himself. The House has an absolute right to order the whole thing printed.

Mr. LEWIS. I should like, if the House will permit, to submit a letter upon the subject by Prof. Manly, one of the principal agents of the commission, giving estimates as to the quantity of

matter involved, and also an estimate of the cost of the printing, made by the chief clerk of the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. That would not throw any light on the point of order. That would be a subsequent consideration. If the Chair should hold that this resolution is in order, why, then, this estimate would be pertinent.

Mr. LEWIS. May I inquire of the Speaker whether, if his ruling should be adverse, a motion to suspend the rules and take up this resolution would be in order at this time?

The SPEAKER. Not on this day. It would have been on Monday a week ago and it will be next Monday.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, in 1880 the House of Representatives adopted a rule providing—

All documents referred to committees or otherwise disposed of shall be printed, unless otherwise specially ordered.

If that were now the rule of the House, this document, referred to a committee in the regular order, would automatically be printed. That was the rule of the House until our friends on the other side of the aisle obtained control of the House in the Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. How many copies would be printed under that order to print?

Mr. MANN. It would be printed. It would be put in type, and that would cover the cost of printing in the main.

Mr. BARNHART. It would be the regular number.

Mr. MANN. It would be the regular, usual number. Now, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS], my colleague from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN], and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] were present here at the opening of the Sixty-second Congress. In the discussion of the rules of the House at that time I pointed out the fact that our friends on that side were leaving out the rule under which documents would be printed when referred to committees; but the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS], my colleague from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN], and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] all voted for the new rules, on the plea that this was reform, and the reform provided that these things shall not be printed. There is no authority of law for printing them. As a matter of fact, the Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House in reference to most of these documents which come before the House, and because of the lack of a rule on the subject, orders the documents printed. But that is a unanimous-consent proposition. An order to print must go to the Committee on Printing. I myself am inclined to think that anything anybody wants printed and that we want to make use of ought to be printed. I am very liberal about that. While I do not have the greatest confidence in the world in the Walsh Commission, that is neither here nor there. I have no doubt these documents will be printed, because there is a demand on the part of people to obtain them. This is an official report. That being the case, it will undoubtedly be printed in sufficient number. But I hope hereafter when I warn my friends on the other side of the House of these things in advance they will take the warning seriously. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, following the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], I am taking this matter seriously. I understand the practice to be that when a thing is submitted to a parliamentary body, it must be put in such physical and tangible condition as to be utilized, read, and understood; and, my God, I can not understand those boxes out there in the hall. [Laughter.] Furthermore, while I am not familiar with your rules and regulations and the ruts in which you have run before, I understand this to be a very inopportune time for any man to become parsimonious or picayunish over the printing of a matter that the whole country and the whole civilized world has got its eyes on. There are more than 40,000 farmers in my State who are interested in the developments made in that investigation as to the land monopolies of Texas, and they are anxious and heart-throbbing about it, and the Federation of Labor and the bankers and business men all through the State have insisted that this report and these proceedings of this commission must be put in such tangible shape that they can get the facts and that the whole matter must be put before them. The press paraded the fact that there were two carloads of it and that it ought to be sent to the junk pile. I want to notify you right now that if there is a man from Texas who votes to have it go to the junk pile, he will meet me on the stump when he gets back to Texas in the next campaign. [Applause.]

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. I want to know if the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations, with the accompanying testimony, has been laid before the House?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. What disposition was made of it, and under what rule was that disposition made?

The SPEAKER. The Chair referred the report to the Committee on Labor.

Mr. WINGO. Did the Chair dispose of the testimony; and if so, under what rule?

The SPEAKER. Yes. The whole thing goes to the Committee on Labor.

Mr. WINGO. Under what rule did the Chair so dispose of it?

The SPEAKER. Under the ordinary rules of the House, which provide that the Chair must refer these things somewhere.

Mr. WINGO. I doubt if the Speaker catches the parliamentary inquiry I want to submit. I understand the situation to be this, that under the mandate of law the Industrial Commission has reported to Congress, not simply its report, but also the accompanying testimony?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. And pursuant to custom and the rule the Speaker has laid both before the House?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Now, does it follow, as a matter of fact, that the House can not make any disposition of either the report or the accompanying testimony, and that the Speaker is bound by some rule to exercise a discretion and refer it to some particular committee? Can not the House at that particular moment dispose of either the report or the accompanying testimony by ordering the printing, or ordering it referred to a committee for consideration looking to the printing of the testimony?

The SPEAKER. The remedy is—

Mr. MANN. Rule XXIV covers it.

Mr. WINGO. I do not understand that Rule XXIV does cover it. Here is the point I want to get at: It would be a useless practice and a useless rule for the Speaker to go through the mere mechanical performance of laying before the House a report and testimony that the law requires to be made. Now, it does occur to me that the moment the Speaker does that, any Member has the right, while it is then before the House, to make a motion for its disposition, for that is the matter which is before the House. And at the time it was laid before the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] was on his feet offering his motion to print.

The SPEAKER. But that is a distinct and separate proposition. It has nothing whatever to do with the reference.

Mr. WINGO. I am not talking about the reference, I am talking about the disposition of this testimony which the Speaker had laid before the House, and the gentleman from Maryland offered a motion to print, which, if carried, would have been a disposition of the matter before the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will read the rule. Rule XXIV, clause 2, says:

2. Business on the Speaker's table shall be disposed of as follows: Messages from the President shall be referred to the appropriate committees without debate. Reports and communications from heads of departments, and other communications addressed to the House, and bills, resolutions, and messages from the Senate may be referred to the appropriate committees in the same manner and with the same right of correction as public bills presented by Members.

Now, it is the universal practice under that rule for the Speaker to refer these matters, and if any gentleman thinks that the Speaker has erred in the matter, the same rules provide a way in which he can get at it. He can ask for a rereference. On the first day of this session there were 2,000 public bills introduced, and in the rush some of them were referred to the wrong committees and some of them had the names of certain Members wrong. Members came in and asked that the error be corrected and that they be rereferred.

Mr. WINGO. A further parliamentary inquiry. The Chair holds under that rule that the Speaker is limited in his action in laying the matter before the House, and that when he lays it before the House for the purpose of making a reference, under that rule the House can not dispose of the matter laid before it?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not going to decide that question until it comes up.

Mr. WINGO. Is it not true that that situation has arisen inasmuch as when the Speaker laid before the House the report with the accompanying documents, the gentleman from Maryland immediately arose and offered his motion to print?

The SPEAKER. No; they have no connection with each other. The matter was completed when the Speaker referred it to the Committee on Labor.

Mr. WINGO. Then, Mr. Speaker, I make this parliamentary inquiry. Did not the gentleman from Maryland have a right to submit his motion at that time? Is it not a fact that when these reports are laid before the House the Speaker says, "without objection, it is referred"?

The SPEAKER. As a matter of fact, the Speaker was not obliged to lay the report before the House; he might have referred it without doing so, but it being a matter of great importance, he did lay it before the House.

Mr. WINGO. Then, under the rules, the House can not dispose of that until some committee presents it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not decided that; it is too late to raise the question, and we have enough on hand to decide the question raised by the gentleman from New York against the resolution of the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. WINGO. I want to say to the Chair that I take this view of it—I may be wrong. This matter being brought before the House, not by the gentleman from Maryland but by the action of the Speaker in laying before the House the matter under consideration, and at that time the Speaker said he referred it to the Committee on Labor, the gentleman from Maryland offered his motion immediately.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that, but they have no connection with each other. The proposition before the House is the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], that this resolution or motion for printing offered by the gentleman from Maryland is not a privileged matter. Now, if any gentleman has an opinion about that he wants to express, and will stick to that point, the Chair will hear him.

Mr. WINGO. I desire to stick to the point, but I would like to ask the Chair at what stage of the parliamentary proceeding would the Speaker hold that a gentleman on the floor could offer a motion to dispose of the accompanying documents?

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman from Maryland had nothing to do with the question which the gentleman from Arkansas is talking about. He could have come in next week with his motion just as well as to-day.

Mr. WINGO. But the gentleman from Maryland offered his motion at the time the matter was before the House. I submit that the report was before the House when the gentleman from Maryland offered his motion. There should be a connection between the two if there is not.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the gentleman's view of it.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are in danger of losing the point and strength of the proposition that was urged by the chairman of the committee [Mr. LEWIS] when we consider the question as to whether or not this is a privileged resolution. It would have been certainly within the Speaker's power, if he had chosen to do so, to have referred it to the Committee on Labor, in so far as the report was concerned, and it would have been within the province of the Speaker to refer the matter regarding the printing of the report to the Committee on Printing. But the Speaker did not do so. I say it would have been within his province to have taken that course.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa what authority the Speaker had to take that course.

Mr. TOWNER. Under the rules that have been quoted. A few minutes ago the Speaker said that they were separate questions, the question of printing was separate and apart from the question of the report. If that be true, it would have been within the power of the Speaker to refer to the Committee on Printing the matter regarding the printing of the report, and to the Committee on Labor the consideration of the report, but the Speaker did not do so. He refers the entire matter to the Committee on Labor, which includes, if it was not differentiated, the printing of the report, and now here is a part of the report of the committee to which the Speaker has committed the entire matter, and the chairman of the committee to which the report is committed makes a motion or recommendation as to the printing of the report.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair will indulge me a moment, I think we are all confusing what is a practice by consent and what is the right of the Chair. Under the rules the Chair has no right to lay before the House this or any other report of its nature. The Chair had the right under the rules to refer this report, and the practice is for the Chair in such matters of importance, in order to inform the House, to say that the Chair lays before the House certain documents and without objection refers them to a designated committee; frequently without saying that, they are referred to such and such a committee.

The Chair sometimes goes further and orders, without objection and by consent of all Members, the printing either of the

report and the accompanying documents or of part of them. But gentlemen are confusing here the practice that is concurred in by consent and the rights and privileges of the Chair. The rule expressly says that the Chair as to certain matters shall lay them before the House for the consideration of the House, and that is so in regard to certain bills that have reached certain stages, but it is not true that anywhere there can be found within the rules the right of the Chair to take such a report that comes to the Congress and submit it in the sense that it is up to the House then for consideration as to what determination shall be made of it. That is the reason the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is in error. He is confusing the ordinary practice that we concur in with the right of the Chair.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. Would it not have been within the power of the Speaker, and would he not have been perhaps compelled, if the question were called to his attention, to refer the matter of printing to the Committee on Printing?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think not. I do not think he has any power whatever to do it except by consent.

Mr. MANN. Oh, a matter of printing in the regular way the Speaker refers in the regular way.

Mr. SHERLEY. But that is not the question of the gentleman from Iowa. The question of the gentleman from Iowa was whether when the Chair lays a matter before the House it is not then in order to have the Chair to indicate what committee shall consider the question of printing. I answered no.

Mr. TOWNER. If the gentleman will pardon me, would it not be the duty of the Speaker at any time when his attention is called to this matter to have referred it to the Committee on Printing?

Mr. SHERLEY. Not at all. The gentleman seems to think that the printing of documents must follow the presentation of them to Congress.

Mr. TOWNER. No; I do not, unless it coincides, as in this case, with the report of the committee.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think the Chair has only one power, and that is to refer this report to what he considered to be the proper committee, except by unanimous consent, and then, if anyone felt that that reference was improper, the rules provide a method whereby the change of reference may be made either by proper motion then or subsequently.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is a report which was required to be made to Congress by the terms of the law creating the commission making the report. When it is sent to the Speaker it comes officially to him as the presiding officer of the House. The rule provides:

Business on the Speaker's table shall be disposed of as follows: "Messages from the President shall be referred to the appropriate committees without debate. Reports and communications from heads of departments and other communications addressed to the House and bills, resolutions, and messages from the Senate may be referred to the appropriate committees."

This was business on the Speaker's table. I think it was his duty to lay it before the House, although the Speaker suggested that he might have referred it without reference in the House. It was "business" on the Speaker's table. The rule does not say that the Speaker shall make the reference, but the rule provides that the only thing that can be done with a communication is to refer it to a committee, or, by implication, to lay it on the table. The House can take no other action in regard to it, and as a matter of common practice the Speaker makes the reference, although it is always in order at the time to make a motion for a reference to some other committee, or afterwards to come in on the motion of a committee itself for a change of reference. This matter being on the Speaker's table and he laying it before the House, under the rules could only do the one thing by unanimous consent—refer it to the Committee on Labor. If he had offered to refer it to some other committee, the gentleman from Maryland, I think, could have made a motion that it be referred to the Committee on Labor. The question of printing is not involved in that proposition at all. While it is the practice of the Speaker on these ordinary propositions to order them printed, that is by unanimous consent only. Any gentleman can stop it if he wishes to object.

The SPEAKER. This debate on subjects not pertinent probably is not without its uses in addition to the debate on the point of order. Some gentlemen mix up the matter of the proposition of reference and the importance of these documents, and as to whether or not this resolution to print additional copies which is pending here now is privileged. If the Chair had any opinion about it, he would agree with some of these gentlemen that there is a demand for the printing of this document. Perhaps there is. The Chair has received sev-

eral requests himself; but that is neither here nor there. The only question the Chair has to decide is whether this resolution of the gentleman from Maryland at this particular juncture is a privileged resolution. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in their statements have very clearly stated everything there was to be said about it, except that the phrase "the Speaker's table" is liable to mislead some people. This desk is not the Speaker's table. In the British Parliament they had a table down in front of the Speaker's stand where they put these documents, and that was literally the Speaker's table, and we still hold to the phrase, but the Speaker's table is around here almost anywhere. The clerks have these documents. The only question is whether or not this report ought to be printed and not whether we ought to print 200,000 or 500,000 copies of it, or whether it ought to be printed at all, or whether it is any good after it is printed, or whether it is the most important document that ever was printed, or whether everybody or nobody wants it.

The question is whether, under the rules and practices of the House, this resolution is privileged. The Chair thinks it is not and that it will have to go through the basket and be referred to the Committee on Printing.

PANAMA-CALIFORNIA EXPOSITION.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 38 and put it on its passage. I desire to state that this is an identical resolution to one which has been introduced in the House and been favorably reported by the House committee. It permits the Government exhibit to be removed from the Panama-Pacific International Exposition at San Francisco down to the Panama-California Exposition at San Diego.

The SPEAKER. When did this resolution come over?

Mr. CANTRILL. It was reported yesterday. That is my information. It is my recollection that it was reported by the Clerk of the Senate here yesterday.

The SPEAKER. What is the number of it?

Mr. CANTRILL. Senate joint resolution 38, which is identical with House resolution No. 3, which has been favorably reported by the House committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will inquire of gentlemen from California if any of them got that resolution that came over here? There were two or three of the gentlemen up here looking at it. In the meantime, we will go ahead with something else until it is found.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 900. An act amending sections 476, 477, and 440 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA LAND GRANTS.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a decision of Judge Wolverton, of the United States District Court of Oregon, in reference to the Oregon and California land grants. His decision was rendered on December 9 last, and it is a decree his court enters on the decision made by the Supreme Court of the United States on this matter in June last.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the document named. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

BRIDGE ACROSS BLACK RIVER, MO.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and consider the bill H. R. 4717—a bridge bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4717) to authorize Butler County, Mo., to construct a bridge across Black River.

Be it enacted, etc., That Butler County, Mo., is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across Black River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the south line of section 10, township 23 north, range 7 east, Butler County, in the State of Missouri, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Has this already been reported?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. It has been favorably reported.

Mr. MANN. This morning?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. By the committee.

Mr. MANN. It was reported this morning, was it?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Reported this morning.

Mr. MANN. I shall not object to that, although we all understand the circumstances. I believe there are several of these. Ordinarily we do not let them pass until they have been in print.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I am anxious to get this through before the holidays.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ARKANSAS RIVER, TULSA, OKLA.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3681, which has been reported favorably from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and also favorably from the War Department. It relates to the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River, by Tulsa County, at or near Tulsa, Okla.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3681) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River, at or near Tulsa, Okla.

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Tulsa, in the State of Oklahoma, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Arkansas River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Tulsa, Okla., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question. What is the urgent necessity for passing this bill at this time, without having it referred and—

Mr. DAVENPORT. It has been referred and reported favorably by the War Department and reported from the committee favorably this morning.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I did not mean without having it referred, but without having it printed.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I can answer the gentleman's question. The county thought, as the railroad company and the toll-bridge company had been permitted to construct bridges there without any authorization, that they could go ahead and do the same thing.

When the county did that the War Department called attention to the fact that it had been declared a navigable stream up to where the county wished to construct a bridge. In the meantime they have several thousand dollars' worth of material on the ground, and they can not go ahead without getting this authority. For that reason it seems important to them to go ahead at this time.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I shall not object. I wish to say, however, that it will not be long before objection will be made to the granting of unanimous consent for the construction of bridges across navigable streams unless the titles of the bills are printed in regular order on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, so that the House and the country, and especially the people of the localities where it is proposed to erect these structures, may be thus duly notified that such legislation is pending.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FISCAL RELATIONS BETWEEN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate joint resolution No. 56, and ask its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution

56, and proceed to the present consideration thereof. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) extending the time for filing the report of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Fiscal Relations between the District of Columbia and the United States.

Resolved, etc. That the joint committee of the two Houses of Congress, appointed pursuant to the act of Congress approved March 3, 1915, is hereby given until the 1st day of February, 1916, in which to file the report required by the said act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the necessity for this? That is, why did not the commission meet and do business?

Mr. RAINEY. I will state, for the information of the gentleman from Illinois, that the printing of the testimony taken before the joint commission is not yet completed. We devoted to these hearings the greater portion of the months of October and November, and the hearings are very voluminous. We heard everybody who wanted to be heard, and the hearings will probably take up 2,000 printed pages. As yet they have not been even indexed.

Mr. MANN. When did the commission first meet here?

Mr. RAINEY. The commission met, I think, on the 20th of October.

Mr. MANN. How long did they sit then?

Mr. RAINEY. They sat almost continuously until the convening of this Congress; until two or three days before the session opened.

I will say that I do not think we shall meet until the 1st of February, but the printing of the hearings not having been completed yet, and the hearings not being indexed—

Mr. MANN. I came down here about the middle of November and saw in the papers every day statements that the commission was going to meet some time in the future; that it was not convenient to meet here now, and so on, and so on.

Mr. RAINEY. I am surprised that the gentleman saw those reports on the 15th of November, because we were in session on the 15th of November, and had been in session from the 20th of October, and we continued in session beyond the 15th of November.

Mr. MANN. Then you must have quit shortly before that time. I came here about the end of November, and saw no mention of any meeting at all.

Mr. RAINEY. We shall not meet again until the 1st of February.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. As I understood, the gentleman was to move to concur in this change of date with an amendment making it the 10th of January?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois will permit, I was going to offer the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, and if it is in order now, Mr. Speaker, I will do so if I can be recognized for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. It is in order now to get unanimous consent to consider it. Is there objection to the present consideration of it?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the resolution by striking out "the 1st day of February" and inserting in lieu thereof "the 10th day of January."

Mr. RAINEY. I have no objection to that amendment, I will say. The only thing we want to do is to be able to come back here after the holidays and carefully consider the report before we present it, and the 10th day of January will be satisfactory.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of this commission, I am frank to say to the House that personally I regret that there has been any request for an extension of time. It seems to me, and has seemed to me, that this commission could do its work, and do its work well, and report by the time given to it by this House in which to report, which was the 1st of January.

This commission began its work under the call of the chairman on the 20th of October. It sat nearly every week day from the 20th of October until the 16th of November. Its sessions were from 10 o'clock in the morning until 1 o'clock in the afternoon, and from 2 o'clock in the afternoon until 5. A great amount of testimony was heard, and so far as I am concerned, as one of the members of the committee, I am entirely ready at this time, even if Congress adjourns to-day, to present a formulated report of what I believe to be right on the question submitted to us for determination by this House.

I realize that this question should be settled, and settled in a way that could be brought to the attention of the Committee

on Appropriations and the Committee on the District of Columbia at a time when the House can take it up, and at a time when it can be studied and when the information obtained shall be available and valuable. I say, therefore, that I regret there has been a request for an extension of time on the part of this commission, for I think the commission ought to be able to present its report at the time mentioned in the authority given it by the House and by the Senate, but in view of the short time now asked beyond the time first assigned, I will interpose no objection to the request as amended.

The SPEAKER. Question.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of that joint select committee, have attended all of its meetings, and wish now to say a word in reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The committee, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] has just said, began its hearings of witnesses on the 20th of October and continued them until the 18th of November. Each day the session lasted from 10 o'clock in the morning until 1 in the afternoon, and from 2 to 5 in the afternoon.

There has been delay in printing the testimony. The last half of the printed pages of revised testimony—there are, in all, more than 1,750 pages—were not received by me nor by other members of the committee until last evening after the House adjourned, and then only in the form of loose sheets. The sheets were still wet from the printing press.

The matters which this committee was appointed to investigate and report upon have long been in dispute, one of them for more than 75 years. The questions involved are of exceeding importance to the people of the District of Columbia, and also, in many respects, to all of the people of the country. Like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD], I would be glad if the committee could have filed its report before this time. I felt sure that it could do so by the 1st of January. But because of the great delay in the printing and of the consequent necessary delay in preparing an index to the testimony, and in view of the fact that the committee must consult the revised printed pages in order that its recommendations may be based upon accurate statements of fact, I approve the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], as amended by the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE], and sincerely hope that the resolution with the amendment will be adopted without objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE], making the extension to the 10th of January.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution appropriating money for the payment of certain claims on account of labor, supplies, materials, and cash furnished in the construction of the Corbett Tunnel;

S. 968. An act granting an extension of time to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in the State of Illinois; and

S. 1230. An act to authorize the construction of bridges across the Fox River at Aurora, Ill.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILL SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 696. An act authorizing the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River at Oil City, Venango County, Pa.

THE "EASTLAND" DISASTER.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, on the 14th instant the Speaker laid before the House the report and testimony taken by the Department of Commerce on the *Eastland* disaster at Chicago. As I understand it, the report embraces the testimony taken by the Steamboat-Inspection Service. It was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I think the testimony and report should have been referred to

the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, as it relates to questions affecting our navigation laws, and we have bills now pending before the committee growing out of that disaster and intended to remedy the conditions in the future and make such disasters less liable to occur.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, that change of reference will be made.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to say that so far as I have been advised that investigation refers not to the rates and practices of transportation, but to the structure and rules for navigating vessels. For that reason, perhaps, I ought not to object to this request. But while I am perfectly willing to yield to the jurisdiction of other committees the things to which I am not entitled, I am beginning to think I ought to complain at their taking and the giving to some of them of bills to which my committee is entitled.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the committee of the gentleman from Georgia has too much business now and that he brings in more bills than anybody else in the House.

Mr. ADAMSON. We do not complain at all of the work we have to do.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the change of reference will be made from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS ROCK RIVER, COLONA FERRY, ILL.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make an inquiry about Senate resolution 38.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL] called up a resolution a few moments ago. There are several gentlemen on this side who desire recognition.

The SPEAKER. Of course the Chair will recognize anybody who wants to be recognized. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING].

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 136) granting an extension of time to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in the State of Illinois.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for the commencement of the bridge authorized by the act entitled "An act to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in the State of Illinois," approved August 19, 1911, is hereby extended to one year from the date of the passage of this act.

SEC. 2. That the construction, maintenance, and operation of the bridge and approaches thereto therein authorized by the aforesaid act shall be in all respects in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANN. Has this bill received consideration and been reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the War Department, too?

Mr. STERLING. It has.

Mr. ADAMSON. There are some amendments to be read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Let the amendments be read first.

The Clerk read the amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Illinois," insert the words "by the counties of Henry and Rock Island, in the State of Illinois."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "act," add the words "and the time for completion of the bridge extended three years from the date of approval of this act."

Strike out all of section 2.

Renumber section 3 to be section 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the reason for the demand for the extension of the time?

Mr. STERLING. As I understand it, the people of these two counties have voted to construct this bridge. There was some delay in getting action by the people of the counties on the matter, and they have not been able to begin the construction of the bridge until this time. The matter was submitted to the people there, and that has caused some delay.

Mr. NORTON. It is a county bridge?

Mr. STERLING. Yes. The two counties join in the building.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what was the date set in the original act for the commencement of the work?

Mr. MANN. One year after its passage.

Mr. STERLING. It was passed in August, 1911.

Mr. ADAMSON. The last extension was in 1913.

Mr. STERLING. The bill was passed in August, 1911.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What was the time set in that act for the beginning of the work of construction?

Mr. STERLING. One year.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That would have begun the work in 1912.

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Was there any subsequent act extending the time?

Mr. STERLING. There was.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What was the date of that?

Mr. ADAMSON. Nineteen hundred and thirteen.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And that extended it to what time?

Mr. ADAMSON. It expired last year, or, rather, this year.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What was the reason given for not beginning the work within one year, as fixed by the original act?

Mr. STERLING. As I understand it, the authorities did not get a vote of the people soon enough to begin the construction of the bridge until this time.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The work of construction under the first act should have begun in 1912. Then, an amendatory act was passed in 1913 extending the time. Why did they not begin then?

Mr. STERLING. For the same reason, as far as I know. My colleague from Illinois may know the particulars about it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me, the matter has been before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a number of times. There are two bodies politic trying to join themselves by this bridge. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] will realize that it is exceedingly difficult for two political bodies to move in harmony and get ready at the same time, or sometimes to get ready at all. They have had one hitch after another, until they have missed the time on both occasions, because they could not get their financing ready. It is reported to the committee now that they have at last reached a point where they can work together and build the bridge, and they want this extension for that reason.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. This extends the time how long?

Mr. ADAMSON. It gives them one year from now to begin the bridge, and three years from now to complete it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] that the time for the building of this bridge has been extended twice, and the reason for the delay is that some of the supervisors were against it, because they thought their constituents did not want it, and they parleyed and delayed, and finally said, "We will put this thing up to the people and let them vote upon it." So they did put it to a vote, and the proposition to build the bridge carried by a very substantial majority at the last election. That is the reason why we are trying to get the bill passed now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. KING. Is it true that a bill of this character was passed through the Senate at the last session?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. KING. What became of it in the House?

Mr. TAVENNER. The bill was introduced by Senator SHERMAN, of Illinois, but I never was asked to take any interest in the bill. The fact is, I did not know that there was such a bill until the day after Congress was adjourned the secretary of Senator SHERMAN called me up and asked me what I had done about it. Since I had not had the bill called to my attention, of course, I did not know that the bill was pending.

Mr. KING. It is true that the bridge is to extend from Rock Island County, in the gentleman's district, to Henry County, in the fifteenth district, and Henry County has delayed the matter on account of having submitted it to a vote of the people?

Mr. TAVENNER. Rock Island County submitted it to a vote of the people.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration?

There was no objection.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PANAMA-CALIFORNIA INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate joint resolution 38 be taken from the Speaker's table and put upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Senate joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 38.

Resolved, etc., That all laws and parts of laws relating to foreign exhibits at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, including importations of the same, and of material necessary for buildings, or otherwise, for their proper exhibit are made applicable to the Panama-California International Exposition now in operation at San Diego, Cal., during the remainder of the year 1916, or during the continuance of the latter exposition during said period.

SEC. 2. That the Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, or such portion thereof as may be determined by the President is advisable, is transferred to the Panama-California International Exposition during its continuance at San Diego, Cal., and until not later than December 31, 1916. And any unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$500,000 made in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914 is reappropriated and made available for expenses attending the transfer and maintenance of said Government exhibit during said period ending not later than the close of the year 1916; and all laws or parts of laws relating to said Government exhibit and constituting a Government exhibit board and authorizing the detail of civilians and Army and Navy officers of the United States in connection with said Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition are continued and made applicable so far as the same may be applicable to the Panama-California International Exposition at San Diego, Cal., during its said continuance.

SEC. 3. That in the passage of this act the United States does not assume any liability of any kind whatever, and does not become responsible in any manner for any bond, debt, contract, expenditure, expense, or liability of the said Panama-California International Exposition, its officers, agents, servants, or employees, or incident to or growing out of the said exposition beyond the reappropriation of the unexpended balance of the appropriation heretofore made in connection with the said Government exhibit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky what the unexpended balance of the \$500,000 is?

Mr. CANTRILL. I understand that there is about \$75,000 unexpended of the original appropriation, which of course would be used to transfer the exhibits back to the different points from whence they came. This bill simply permits the transfer of the exhibit to the San Diego exposition on its way back to the original places where the exhibits belong. It calls for no new appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER. The original law requires that the exhibits shall be taken to California and returned without additional expense to the Government. Can the gentleman give us some information as to what it would require to return that exhibit to the National Government?

Mr. CANTRILL. I could not tell the gentleman, for I am not advised as to what it would cost to return it from San Francisco to the National Government, but it would cost very little more if it is returned by the way of San Diego Exposition. It is to be returned, and there is this balance of about \$75,000. Section 3 of the bill specially provides that there shall be no additional expense assumed by the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. There is about \$76,000 remaining, and it is proposed that this shall be used for transferring the exhibit by the way of San Diego to Washington, D. C., so as to give the exposition of the city of San Diego a chance to see the Government exhibit. I judge from that that all of the people of San Diego have not had an opportunity to go to San Francisco and see that great exposition, and that this will afford them an opportunity at San Diego.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. I think the gentleman narrows the scope of the matter very considerably. There are many thousands of people who visit San Diego and the southern part of California every year, especially during the winter season. This appropriation will enable them to see this splendid Government exhibit at San Diego, where, as I say, many thousands of people may go next year who perhaps did not see it at San Francisco; under this resolution they will still be enabled to see something of the Government's activities.

Mr. FOSTER. That is just what I was referring to. I think the exposition at San Diego, from what I have read about it, is worthy of consideration. Of course, I realize that the enterprising people at San Diego found out that there was \$75,000 of this appropriation left unused at San Francisco—

Mr. KAHN. I think the gentleman is unfair.

Mr. FOSTER. And, in order to see that it might be kept in California, these most enterprising people of the city of San Diego, for whom I have a wonderful admiration, as well as for the State, have asked that the exhibit be sent to the San Diego Exposition. They want to keep the exposition open another

year, so that the people of California and visitors going there may have an opportunity of seeing the exhibit, showing what the Government is doing.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from Illinois evidently does not understand. I take it, that a large amount of this sum will be expended to bring the exhibit back to the city of Washington. The amount that it will cost to transfer the exhibit to San Diego is comparatively small, and the balance of the money will have to be expended anyhow to bring the exhibit back to the city of Washington. So that the additional cost to the Government for this transfer is exceedingly small.

Mr. MANN. It will cost just about as much to bring it to San Diego from San Francisco as it would cost to bring it from San Francisco to the city of Washington.

Mr. KAHN. Oh, no; I think not.

Mr. MANN. The main cost of transference is not the freight rate. I understand that the principal reason for this resolution is to have the Government give recognition to the exposition at San Diego, for the reason that without that recognition the people who have the foreign exhibits at San Francisco will not take their exhibits to San Diego. These foreign exhibitors at San Francisco are now breaking up their exhibits, and this is the prime object of the resolution. Unless this resolution passes speedily they will have been transferred elsewhere. It is now 4 minutes of 3 o'clock. This is a Senate resolution, and if it passes the House it goes back to the Senate. It has been put in an enrolled form so that there will be no delay. Unless it passes both bodies and gets the signature of the President immediately it will be valueless for the main purpose, because we are going to take a final adjournment for the holiday recess to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that in view of my high regard for the Representative from that district, Mr. KETTNER, and my great admiration for California and its people, and the fact that they have been able to run two expositions for one year, and one exposition for two years, I think the Government should lend some assistance, and I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

By unanimous consent, House resolution 3, of similar import, was laid on the table.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. SCOTT of Michigan to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of C. Horatio Scott, H. R. 18703, no adverse report having been made thereon.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. McARTHUR to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Minnie Anderson, H. R. 19682, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to transfer the Government exhibit from the Panama-Pacific International Exposition to the Panama-California Exposition, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916;

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution authorizing payment of the salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1915;

H. R. 663. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Citizens' Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Burlington, Iowa; and

H. R. 3638. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the St. Francis River at or near St. Francis, Ark.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, for two days, to Mr. KONOP, on account of illness in family.

OBSERVANCE OF THE RULES.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GARDNER, is entitled to an hour at this time in which to address the House, and the gentleman from Wyoming, Mr. MONDELL, to an hour at the conclusion of Mr. GARDNER's address.

In view of the heat which developed in the discussion yesterday, the Chair wishes to state that there are two or three

rules of the House to which no one seems to pay very much attention. One of them is that a Member sitting in his seat shall not inject any remarks into the speech of the gentleman who has the floor. Another is about the way of getting recognition to interrupt the Member who has the floor. The third rule which the Chair has in mind is that one Member shall not refer directly and personally to another. All of these rules were passed in the interest of decency and order, and the Chair hopes, no matter how heated the discussion may become, that they will be observed. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GARDNER, is recognized for one hour. [Applause.]

PREPAREDNESS.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that what the Chair says is true. The Constitution itself says that no one shall be questioned elsewhere for what he says on the floor of this House, but that makes it doubly necessary for this House, in defense of its own dignity, to see to it that characters are not assailed without some opportunity for defense being offered.

LET US INVESTIGATE BOTH SIDES.

I have introduced a resolution for the investigation of certain organizations: The Navy League, to which I do not belong, although I have been instrumental in starting a branch of the Navy League in Massachusetts; the National Security League, to which I do not belong, although I was one of those who encouraged its organization in the first place; Labor's International Peace Council, to which I do not belong; and the American Defense Society, to which I do not belong. If the Committee on Rules feels that for international reasons it is not wise to investigate Labor's National Peace Council, well and good—cut that out of my resolution; but investigate all of these organizations which have been assailed, not alone in this House but by pacifists all over the country. Those assaults—and the clippings I have seen show very clearly what is being said in the country—mention my name and those of other reputable persons and charge that the origin of this campaign for preparedness rests with the makers of munitions of war and armor plate. Very well. If the Committee on Rules is prepared to protect the Members of the House and citizens who have no other protection from assault on the floor of the House, it will report my resolution; it will investigate me, and not only investigate me, but it will investigate the former Secretary of State and find out if he is making any money out of his propaganda, and it will investigate other gentlemen, on whichever side of the question they may be found. [Applause.]

LET US HAVE FACTS, NOT ARGUMENTS.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to say very little about the general principles governing the problems of our national defense. We all have sufficient knowledge of this question of preparedness from that point of view. What we want now is particular knowledge of the facts. We want to know what military force we have to-day as well as what is proposed. Before I get down to details, however, I desire to leave two thoughts for your reflection. In considering whether it is wise for the United States to enter into treaties providing for the arbitration of all questions, ask yourselves whether the labor unions of this country would consent to arbitrate the Asiatic-exclusion doctrine. Reflect on California's experience with Chinese cheap labor, and then ask any labor man of your acquaintance whether he would ever consent to arbitrate before a world court a demand for the repeal of the Chinese-exclusion law. Ask yourselves whether the American people would ever arbitrate the Monroe doctrine. Here is another thing I want you to think of: Mr. Bryan advocates treaties by which we bind ourselves not to go to war without a year's warning. Furthermore, he proposes that at the end of the year the people shall vote on the question of war or peace. Is that a safe system? Would the nature of the political campaign which would be conducted in that year be such as to enable us to go to war a united nation when the year had expired and the vote had been taken? Consider what the effect would have been if we had delayed a year before resorting to arms in the Revolution and in the Civil War.

A MANUAL FOR DEBATERS.

I prepared last January what I called a Manual for Debaters. Copies are at the disposal of anyone who asks for them. In that manual I gave original references to public documents or to the evidence on which my statements were based. Since then there have been developments, so that many of the facts which I shall allege this afternoon can not be substantiated from that manual. The very first statement which I shall make refers to an occurrence of a date more recent than the manual; but I propose to tell you where its substantiation can be found. In fact, I shall endeavor to follow that policy throughout the whole of this address, which will relate almost entirely to the Navy.

THE NORTH SEA BATTLE.

There has been only one naval battle in this war in which fleets of great modern fighting ships were engaged on both sides. That engagement took place in the North Sea on January 25, 1915. Taking the British fleet and the German fleet together, there were nine great fighting ships in the line of battle, not to mention the smaller fry—the destroyers, light cruisers, submarines, and so on. Of these nine fighting ships in line of battle, eight were capital ships, and the ninth, the *Bluecher*, was a capital ship when she was completed in 1909. The term "capital" ship is applied to a ship capable of taking its place in the first line of battle. In present-day usage the term is only applied to battle cruisers and dreadnaughts; although, as a matter of fact, in the North Sea engagement Germany actually used the powerful armored cruiser *Bluecher* in the first line of battle.

There were nine big ships engaged, five on the British side and four on the German side. The British ships were the *Lion*, the *Tiger*, the *Indomitable*, the *New Zealand*, and the *Princess Royal*. The German ships were the *Seydlitz*, the *Derfflinger*, the *Moltke*, and the *Bluecher*. One of those vessels, the German armored cruiser *Bluecher*, was sent to the bottom of the sea. Why was she sent to the bottom of the sea? Because the *Bluecher* was slower by 4 nautical miles per hour than any other of those nine ships. So when the German fleet turned toward Helgoland the *Bluecher* lagged behind and became a target for the British fleet, and she was sent to the bottom of the sea. The *Bluecher*, which was sent to the bottom of the sea largely because she was 4 nautical miles slower than any other vessel in that battle, was faster than the fastest capital ship or armored cruiser in the American Navy, built or building. You will find corroboration of that statement on pages 853 and 854 of the United States Navy Yearbook for 1914. (S. Doc. No. 637, 63d Cong., 3d sess.)

THE GENERAL BOARD OF THE NAVY.

At home a great many people have said to me, "GARDNER, why is it you people down in Congress do not have a board or commission or something—we do not care what you call it—to decide what sort of a navy we need to make us safe, and then you can go ahead and provide it?" Now, that is a sensible question, and the answer is that we have had precisely such a board ever since 1903. Year after year we have kicked the board's recommendations into the waste-paper basket. That board is called the General Board of the Navy. It was instituted in 1903, the same year in which we voted for five battleships. In 1903 Secretary Moody and President Roosevelt decided that they ought to have a report as to what we needed to make us safe, and so they constituted this General Board of the Navy. Along in October, 1903, the General Board made its report. Since that time, year after year, the board has sent in an annual report, recommending a building program for each year. In 1903, after examining into the building programs of other nations, and after taking into account our geographical situation and all the other elements of the problem, the board reported on what we needed to make us safe. Safe against what? Safe against any nation except Great Britain. Now, why except Great Britain? Because the board assumed the friendliness of Great Britain. It used Germany as a standard by which to measure our necessities. Germany was not actually mentioned by name as our strongest probable enemy; but in the memorandum attached to the report that country was indicated both by its geographical situation and by a citation of its naval legislation.

This 1903 report called for a navy centering around a fleet of 48 battleships. Later on the program was amended so as to call for 48 battleships less than 20 years old. Nothing in the original report was said about the age of superannuation. The board has changed from time to time its recommendations as to the number of destroyers, but never, unless this year, in its most recent report, has the board changed its estimate as to the number of battleships required. As I shall indicate later, the board's recent report was submitted under instructions which forced it to offer a restricted program. I shall take that matter up when I compare the new program of the Secretary of the Navy and the new program of the General Board with that old program for 48 battleships.

HOW DOES OUR NAVY RANK?

In considering a building program we must take into account what other nations have done and are doing. Let us see what story our Navy Department tells us. I hold in my hand a bulletin of the Office of Naval Intelligence of the United States Navy Department. It is entitled "Warship Tonnage of the Principal Naval Powers." It is reproduced on a smaller scale to face page 850, United States Navy Yearbook, 1914. It is

dated July 1, 1914, just before the war broke out, and is the last bulletin of the kind which has been published by our Navy Department. In this bulletin is given the relative warship tonnage of all the principal nations of the world. Ships over 20 years old are not included; neither are ships authorized but not begun. The table comprises warship tonnage both built and building.

I read from the first column, headed, "Present order. Tonnage completed." The date is July 1, 1914, remember:

Great Britain, 2,157,850 tons; Germany, 951,713; United States, 765,133 tons. Now, mind you, those are the figures for tonnage complete a year ago last July. Let us see how the score would have stood if we add to the tonnage complete the tonnage then building. Here I read from the second column in this table. It shows the tonnage complete, plus tonnage building: Great Britain, 2,714,106 tons; Germany, 1,306,577 tons; France, third, 899,915 tons; United States, fourth, 894,889 tons.

Now let us see how we stand in the list of modern fighting ships, the capital ships—as I said, vessels authorized but not begun are not included. This bulletin which I am exhibiting shows, of course, that Great Britain leads in battleships of the dreadnaught type. By the way, my friends, any battleship anterior to the dreadnaught type is about as much up to date as a one-cylinder automobile. This table of our Office of Naval Intelligence, dated July 1, 1914, gives us the following figures of the world's dreadnaughts: Great Britain, 36 built and building; Germany, 20 built and building; the United States, 12 built and building. Since that day we have started three more dreadnaughts building and last March we authorized two additional, but no work will be done on either of them for months to come. Next let us look at the international figures in the matter of battle cruisers. You know what battle cruisers are. A battle cruiser, except that it is lightly armored, is nothing more nor less than a dreadnaught which is speeded through the water at the rate of a railroad train. For instance, take the battle cruiser *Queen Mary*. She is a ship of 27,000 tons, the same size as the *New York* and the *Texas*, our latest dreadnaughts in commission. We are building bigger ones now. The speed of the dreadnaughts *New York* and *Texas* is 21 nautical miles per hour.

The dreadnaught *Nevada* on her trial trip the other day beat that record by a fraction of a mile.

What do you suppose is the speed of the British battle cruiser *Queen Mary*? According to the latest United States Navy Yearbook, 1914, page 852, her speed is no less than 35.7 nautical miles per hour, 12 nautical miles an hour faster than the *Nevada*. Jane's "Fighting Ships" assigns a speed of 33 nautical miles an hour to the *Queen Mary*.

Let us see how we stand in the matter of battle cruisers according to this same official bulletin which I hold in my hand. On July 1, 1914, I find the following figures: Great Britain, battle cruisers, built and building, 10; Germany, battle cruisers, built and building, 8; United States, battle cruisers, built and building, 0.

Now, why have we no battle cruisers? More than once Capt. Hobson, of Alabama, has offered amendments providing them. In 1912 both the General Board of the Navy and Secretary Meyer recommended their construction. One of the principal reasons why we have no battle cruisers is because they cost a good deal more than battleships, and we do not want to pay the bill.

If you want to understand the situation in this House, turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 5, 1915, and read the words of the Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, at that time chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. Mr. UNDERWOOD proposed that we should only authorize one single solitary battleship in 1915 on account of the expense. He said that in his opinion we should never be obliged to go to war to maintain American principles. That sounds well, of course, and it is a certainty that you can save money that way—for a while, at least.

STOP HUMBING.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to build a Navy, let us build a real Navy. Let us quit this make-believe pretense that all our geese are swans. Let us face the music and see what an adequate Navy is going to cost us. Do not go ahead with the idea that by stopping a little picaune logrolling here and there and by dismantling a useless navy yard or so and by abandoning some political Army posts that we shall thereby save enough money to cut some figure in the aggregate bill that we have got to face. We have got to face a perfectly stupendous bill if we want to make this country safe. The question is, Do we or do we not want to face that bill?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERLEY). Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. What does the gentleman consider a safe navy as compared with other navies?

Mr. GARDNER. I have repeatedly said that an adequate navy for the United States is a navy large enough to take the sea and keep the sea against any navy which any nation can bring to attack us. For instance, our Navy must be large enough to hold the sea against such part of the British battle fleet as Great Britain could mass for an attack on us at any particular time.

DREADNAUGHT VERSUS SUBMARINE.

Many people think that the days of the dreadnaught are at an end and that the days of the submarine have come. If that were true, Germany would have had control of the sea last summer, when her submarines were so active. If that were true, it would not be German ships that we should see interned in New York Harbor. It would be British ships. If the submarine were mistress of the sea, Great Britain would not be able safely to move one and three-quarter millions of men from Australia and Canada and Africa and the British Isles to the battle fields of the Continent. If the dreadnaught had lost its supremacy, letters addressed to England would not be delivered except by the grace of Germany. Yet each one of you knows that the letter which you mail in Washington to-day will be delivered in London with very slight delay.

WHERE ARE OUR SUBMARINES?

But let us, for the sake of argument, admit that the day of the dreadnaught has gone by and that the day of the submarine has come. My friends, where are our submarines? On the Atlantic coast we have just 18 submarines, of which 5—the "C" boats—are kept down at the Panama Canal. The remaining 13 submarines includes, among others, the G-3, authorized in 1909. For some reason which I do not understand the Navy Department carries the G-3 as in full commission, while the Bureau of Construction and Repair calls it 93 per cent completed. I have been told that it can not submerge and that it remains tied up to the surface of the water in the Brooklyn Navy Yard. At all events, G-3 was not in the Hudson River parade last summer nor did it take part in the subsequent maneuvers.

We have, therefore, only 12 submarines with which to guard 3,000 miles of coast from the St. Croix River to the Rio Grande. I do not know the condition of those submarines just now. I know their condition when they were tried out in maneuvers last May, for Secretary Daniels publicly admitted the breakdown of five or six of them. (Daily papers, May 28, 1915.) I know about their condition in November, 1914, when Admiral Fletcher ordered the submarine flotilla to mobilize, for I heard the evidence before the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives.

The New York Tribune about a year ago published a series of Navy articles. In one of these articles the assertion was made that at the November mobilization only one submarine was in condition to dive. The Committee on Naval Affairs started to investigate the facts. On December 15, 1914, Commander Yates Stirling, jr., testified. At that time he was in command of the submarine flotilla. Representative ROBERTS, of Massachusetts, a member of the Naval Committee, called attention to the newspaper article, and then he said to Stirling:

I am asking you that question because some newspapers state that there is only 1 submarine out of the 17 that will dive.

Commander STIRLING. I think I can explain where they got that impression. The Commander in Chief ordered the mobilization of the Atlantic submarine flotilla at Hampton Roads on the 1st of November of all available vessels. He left it to me to say what vessels I would bring down there. He did not consider the 5 at Colon. That reduced the number in the flotilla to 12.

Commander Stirling goes on to tell why this boat and that boat were not available, and then he winds up by saying:

So when we got down there the admiral wanted to know what we could do. I told him we had then only 1 submarine that I thought could efficiently take part in the maneuvers at sea off the coast. (Naval bill hearings, Dec. 15, 1914, pp. 866, 867.)

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. Does the gentleman mean to say that this country can not produce submarines that are efficient at all, and that over-sea countries are the only ones that can build them in such a way as that they can go to sea?

Mr. GARDNER. What I have told you is our exact experience.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GARDNER. Certainly.

Mr. ELSTON. Can the gentleman give any reason or explanation from his experience for this condition?

Mr. GARDNER. It is a long story. If the gentleman will read the evidence before the Committee on Naval Affairs last year he will get a fair idea of the situation. The trouble is a good deal a question of batteries. Perhaps the shortage of officers and crews may be partly to blame.

WHERE ARE OUR AIR CRAFT?

A great many people think that the days of the submarine have gone by, and that air craft are now able to detect submarines and point them out for destruction. That may or may not be the case; but, for the sake of argument, let us admit that air craft can master the submarine danger.

Mr. Speaker, where are our air craft? I am going to cite the evidence of Capt. Mark Bristol, in charge of the air fleet of the Navy. (Naval bill hearings, Dec. 3, 1914, p. 299.) Capt. Bristol told of the air fleets of various countries at the breaking out of the war. He stated that at that time, according to his information, France had 22 dirigibles and 1,400 aeroplanes, Russia 18 dirigibles and 800 aeroplanes, Germany 40 dirigibles and 1,000 aeroplanes, and so forth, and the United States 23 aeroplanes. Of those 23 aeroplanes, 10 belonged to the Army and 11 belonged to the Navy. I noticed that when the senior naval advisor of the Secretary of the Navy spoke at the Naval Academy alumni dinner at Annapolis he told his hearers that at that time the Navy had only three good aeroplanes. (Morning papers, June 4, 1915.) Secretary Daniels's report of December 1, 1915, informs us that the Navy now possesses 15 such craft.

Few as are our aeroplanes we have no airships at all unless the situation has changed very recently. It is true that the Secretary of the Navy has ordered one dirigible at a very moderate expense, but the newspapers say that the contract speed is only 25 to 35 miles. So leisurely a craft would not cut much figure against the swift airships of the European war.

HOW MANY DREADNAUGHTS?

We constantly hear incorrect accounts as to the actual strength of our Navy at the present time. Desire to confuse the issue is sometimes the source of the difficulty, but more often loose statement is responsible. For instance, just as soon as a new dreadnaught is authorized by Congress it is added to the list of dreadnaughts just exactly as if it were ready to fight. The two battleships which we authorized last March will not be begun for months to come and will not be finished for nearly four years; yet in debate in this House and in published lists they are reckoned as if they were actually in full commission. Four submarines which we voted to build on June 30, 1914, had not been begun one year later on June 30, 1915. (See Navy and Marine Corps List and Directory, Aug. 1, 1915, p. 104.) Nevertheless they are spoken of in debate as if they constituted an actual part of our Navy.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY. I noticed in the newspapers some time ago—I do not know whether it was true or not—that the Bethlehem Steel Co. had finished quite a large number of submarines for a foreign navy within a period of four months. Does the gentleman know whether that is true or not?

Mr. GARDNER. I know it to be a fact that the Fore River Shipbuilding Co. in a very short space of time finished the parts of a large number of submarines, which were speedily put together and sent abroad within a very few months after the order was received; but it is fair to say that they were small craft for the most part.

Mr. KELLEY. If the gentleman will permit me, if I remember correctly, last year there were some 19 submarines previously authorized which had not yet been delivered, and since that time we have added 25. Out of that 44, does the gentleman know how many have been delivered?

Mr. GARDNER. I will tell the gentleman exactly. At the present time we have 37 submarines completely built. That includes every submarine we ever built except the old A-1, which was scrapped, and the F-4, which was sunk off Hawaii. I am reading now from the Navy and Marine Corps List and Directory for December 1, 1915, pages 106 and 108. In addition, we have at this moment 19 more which are building. They were authorized in 1912, 1913, and 1914. (See U. S. Navy Yearbook, 1914, p. 735.) Furthermore, we have another 19 which have been authorized but are not even begun. One of them was authorized on June 30, 1914, and the others on March 3, 1915.

Mr. NORTON. Can the gentleman tell us why they have not been begun?

Mr. GARDNER. No; I can not tell you. I think one of the minor difficulties is that Congress has not given to the Navy

Department a sufficient number of draftsmen. I think there has been a good deal of disputing as to the type of batteries to be used. About four years ago some young officers of the Navy—I rather think Lieut. Miles was one—went to Thomas A. Edison and asked him if he could develop a battery for submarines. I am told that Mr. Edison has been four years experimenting. I hope Congress will get a fair, unsterilized report on the Edison batteries. I hear very divergent stories as to their success.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman's argument seems to impress me as carrying the inference that our military officers are altogether incompetent, or inferior to the officers of Germany or England.

Mr. GARDNER. I am not going into that.

Mr. NORTON. Is that the purpose of the gentleman's argument?

Mr. GARDNER. No; that is not the purpose.

Mr. SNYDER. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. GARDNER. All right.

Mr. SNYDER. I should like to ask the gentleman if he knows whether the submarines or parts of submarines that have been furnished by the Schwab or Bethlehem steel companies have been operating successfully?

Mr. GARDNER. I do not know anything about the Schwab or Bethlehem companies. I know about the Fore River Ship Building Co., and that is the only one I know about. I am told that Schwab has bought up the plant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to continue—

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. You seem to object—

Mr. GARDNER. Is this a question for information, or do you want to discuss some general principle?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Oh, no; I just want to ask you a question.

Mr. GARDNER. All right, go ahead.

Mr. CALLAWAY. You object to our contention that submarines that have been ordered should be counted when we go to considering a new program?

Mr. GARDNER. No; I do not object to that. I object to your sending out information to the people that is not correct.

SLOW CONSTRUCTION OF BATTLESHIPS.

I hold in my hand the Navy and Marine Corps List and Directory for December 1, 1915. On pages 106 and 107 you will find the name of every first-line battleship we possess. I am not talking about ships that are building or ships whose construction we have authorized. I am talking about what we actually possess to-day. How many do you suppose there are? There are just eight, of which one is in reserve—the *North Dakota*—because four times already in its short career it has had to have its turbines repaired.

The *Arkansas*, *Delaware*, *Florida*, *New York*, *Texas*, *Utah*, and *Wyoming* are the only first-line battleships which we have in full commission to-day. They are all dreadnaughts. To be sure, the *Oklahoma* and *Nevada* also are practically ready, but when do you think that their construction was authorized? It was authorized on the 4th day of March, 1911, four years and nine months ago. (U. S. Navy Yearbook, 1914, p. 834.)

It is true that in each case there has been a substantial delay owing to exceptional causes. So we have, as a matter of fact, 8 first-line battleships finished, 2 practically ready, 5 in process of building, and 2 authorized but not begun. Yet you will repeatedly hear on the floor of this House the glib statement that we possess 17 dreadnaughts.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. This is the type of vessel that the gentleman says is the necessary fighting unit of the Navy?

Mr. GARDNER. I am simply giving my opinion.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And that is supplemented by the swift type of battle cruiser?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; that is my idea.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. FARR. Has the gentleman any information how long it takes a foreign nation to build a superdreadnaught?

Mr. GARDNER. In England it takes about two years, or a little more, from the date of the laying of the keel. That is to say, in peace time. I think that recently it has been taking us 8 or 10 months longer than that; but, in addition, we delay prodigiously before the keel is laid.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Did I understand the gentleman to state a while ago that the fastest ship we had in the first-class line was slower than the slowest ship that Germany had in the first-class line?

Mr. GARDNER. No; I did not say so. I said that the fastest battleship or first-line ship of any sort which we own, built or building, is slower than the slowest ship of the nine which were engaged in the battle line of the North Sea fight.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. One more question.

Mr. GARDNER. No; I decline to yield further.

FIVE YEARS AWAY FROM PREPAREDNESS.

The most significant evidence that was given last year before the Committee on Naval Affairs was given by Rear Admiral Bradley A. Fiske, at that time senior naval adviser of the Secretary of the Navy. In response to a question, Admiral Fiske said that it would take us about five years to get our Navy into shape to fight successfully and effectively against an effective enemy. (Naval bill hearings, Dec. 17, 1914, p. 1023.)

I have not seen a single denial of that statement, nor have I heard its soundness questioned.

CAN AN ENEMY LAND?

Last year Admiral Fletcher, commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet, testified that a foreign foe, after disposing of our Navy, could land almost anywhere on our coast. (Naval bill hearings, Dec. 9, 1914, p. 536.) Of course, there was a storm of denial of Admiral Fletcher's testimony. Recently I took the matter up with Admiral Dewey, chairman of the General Board of the Navy. Here is the admiral's letter, in which he describes our exposure to the landing of a hostile force:

OFFICE OF THE ADMIRAL OF THE NAVY,
Washington, December 10, 1915.

HON. A. P. GARDNER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GARDNER: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of December 9, asking me to write you setting forth my views on the question of the possibility of large hostile forces landing on our coast, and inviting my attention to an article by Eric Fisher Wood, which appeared in the Century last month.

The part of the Atlantic coast mentioned in Mr. Wood's article extends from Eastport, Me., to Cape Henry, Va., and in this area we have permanent defenses on the Penobscot and Kennebec Rivers, at Portland, Portsmouth, Boston, and New Bedford Harbors, at Narragansett Bay, at the eastern entrance to Long Island Sound, at the entrance to New York Harbor, on the Delaware River, at Baltimore, on the upper Potomac River, and at Hampton Roads. Of these defenses only those at Portland, Narragansett Bay, entrance to Long Island Sound, and the entrance to New York protect the coast; the others are solely harbor defenses.

It is true that a large hostile force can land on the open coast wherever the transports can get within reasonable distance of the shore, and especially so where their landing is covered by the gunfire of the naval escort, even though the landing be opposed by troops. The most recent example of this is the landing of the allied troops on the Gallipoli Peninsula. We have similar examples in our own history, as the landing of Scott's army near Vera Cruz, the landings near Fort Fisher, and the landing of Shafter's army on the south coast of Cuba. From Eastport, Me., to Cape Henry, Va., there are but very few places where large ships can not approach with safety to within 2 miles of the coast, and the extent of this shore line that is too precipitous or too ragged to make a landing impracticable is small. The only force that can prevent such a landing is a navy of our own strong enough to prevent such an expedition from reaching our coast.

In saying that a hostile expedition can land upon our coast at will, outside the range of our coast-defense guns, I mean that it is physically possible and with no very great difficulty. I do not mean that such a force could accomplish its object by landing anywhere on our coast. No commander would desire to have his force isolated on the peninsula of Maine nor on the sand dunes of New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, or Virginia, with inland waters between them and the mainland. They will prefer to land where there are railroads and good roads leading to their objective, which would probably be one of our large cities. Such places are numerous along the coast of Massachusetts, both shores of Massachusetts Bay, the eastern end and south shore of Long Island, and in the Delaware and Chesapeake Bays.

A landing place sheltered from the force of the sea would greatly facilitate the disembarkation of a hostile force, but is not a vital necessity. Such sheltered places are too numerous to name, but among them are Frenchmans Bay, Penobscot Bay, Blue Hill Bay, Sheepscot River, Casco Bay in Maine, Rockport, Gloucester, Salem, Plymouth, Provincetown, Vineyard Sound, and Buzzards Bay in Massachusetts, Fort Pond Bay, and then to the southward Delaware and Chesapeake Bays. Only the Navy can prevent landings at those places, and that Navy must be strong enough to defeat the enemy; and should we have such a navy the enemy would not attempt an invasion as long as it remained in existence.

Our main defense and protection from invasion must therefore always rest with the Navy, which must ever remain our first and best line of defense. This defense, unless adequate, is impotent; and, as before stated, adequacy is not reached until the Navy is strong enough to meet on equal terms the navy of the strongest probable adversary.

Sincerely, yours,

GEORGE DEWEY.

SECRETARY DANIELS'S BUILDING PLAN.

Now, let us take up the President's message and Secretary Daniels's building program. The program of the General Board of the Navy we can not take up, because it will not be released until next Wednesday. It has just been sent to us all in confidence. I shall not comment on it except as to certain matters of which I was cognizant prior to the reception of this

confidential report. To those particular matters I shall not hesitate to allude.

In the first place, as I publicly stated on November 18, the General Board of the Navy has made two reports. Only the second report will be published next Wednesday, and the second report was made under instructions limiting the board's freedom of action. The first report was untrammelled. It was made in compliance with the President's query as to what naval strength we need for our protection.

What the Secretary has done with that first report no one knows. Instead of communicating it to Congress, he has sent us the board's hampered report. This hampered report was prepared in compliance with the Secretary's order to cut the new construction cost down to about one hundred millions a year. In other words, instead of letting the General Board tell us what it thinks we need and leaving it to us to judge of the amount of expenditure which we are willing to devote to the Navy, Secretary Daniels instructed the board as to just how much expenditure they should be permitted to recommend. If you want to know what the General Board really thinks, order out the withheld report of July 30, 1915.

AN EIGHT-YEAR PROGRAM.

As I said a little while ago, the previous program of the General Board called for a Navy large enough to meet the German Navy building program. This previous program called for a fleet centering around 48 battleships less than 20 years old. This new program of the General Board, prepared under the financial restrictions imposed by Secretary Daniels, calls for only 46 battleships and battle cruisers less than 20 years old when the building is completed in 1924. I think 1924 is a fair date to fix for the actual completion of Secretary Daniels's program. That allows eight years from the time we accept the Secretary's program, provided that we accept it during the present session of Congress. We are proposing to vote the money in five successive years. Three out of the sixteen new capital ships are not to be authorized until the last year. As it takes four years after the date of authorization to build a dreadnaught, and probably about the same length of time to build a battle cruiser, 1924 is a reasonable date to set for the completion of the program.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

Now suppose we verify my statement as to our battleship fleet. It differs radically from that of President Wilson and Secretary Daniels. To be sure, in arriving at their conclusions, they have taken the year 1921 to figure on instead of the year 1924, just as if dreadnaughts and cruisers were complete the minute that their construction was authorized by Congress.

For the sake of argument, let us assume that it is fair to take the year 1921 for our comparison. According to the President, we shall have in 1921 the following "effective" battleships built and building, to wit, 27 battleships of the first line, 25 battleships of the second line, not to mention 6 battle cruisers, making 58 capital ships in all, built and building. Secretary Daniels arrives at the same figures, but he does not say that those second-line battleships will be "effective." All he says is that he accepts "the General Board estimate of survival for present vessels."

Of course everyone agrees that under Daniels's plan, in 1921 we shall have 27 first-line battleships and 6 battle cruisers, if we count every ship authorized whether the keel has been laid or not. But how about the second liners?

The President says that in 1921 we shall have 25 effective battleships in the second line. The President must be a real lover of antiques, for neither he nor anyone else can count those 25 battleships without including in the list the dear old Spanish War veterans, the *Massachusetts*, the *Oregon*, and the *Iowa*. They were authorized in 1890, and they are not even carried in the list of battleships in our own Navy Yearbook. (U. S. Navy Yearbook, 1914, p. 854.) Nevertheless, they can be resuscitated and counted by a passionate archaeologist, like President Wilson. In the Navy Yearbook we shall find only 22 battleships, but by the end of 1921 six of them will be over 20 years old, and at the end of 1924 only 13 of them will be less than 20 years old. Hence my statement that the new program set forth by Secretary Daniels calls for only 46 battleships and battle cruisers less than 20 years old when the building program is actually completed in 1924.

Twenty-seven dreadnaughts, 6 battle cruisers, and 13 pre-dreadnaughts less than 20 years old in the second line. In all, 46 battleships and cruisers when the program is complete. You can not add a single battleship to that total to save your life, unless you disregard the 20-year superannuation rule laid down by the General Board of the Navy.

Yet Secretary Daniels claims that there will be 25 battleships of the second line in 1921. Furthermore he declares that he accepts "the General Board estimates of survival for present vessels." I simply can not understand that declaration. In November, 1914, the General Board wrote to Secretary Daniels that already, prior to May, 1910, "experience had shown that the three older battleships, the *Indiana*, *Massachusetts*, and *Oregon*, then 20 years old from date of authorization, were approaching the limit of their effective life." (Report of General Board of Navy, Nov. 17, 1914, sec. 10.) If those ships were approaching superannuation in 1910, what will be their condition in 1921? Here is another sentence from the General Board's report for 1914: "Further studies from our own experience and from that of other navies and from practice abroad convinces the General Board that the effective life of battleships is about 20 years from time of completion." I can not reconcile that report with Secretary Daniels's statement that in preparing his table of battleships he accepted "the General Board estimate of survival for present vessels."

As a matter of fact, if Secretary Daniels's program is accepted the building will be completed in 1924. Instead of 25 battleships in the second line at the end of 1924 we shall have but 13 battleships not superannuated. Of these 13 ships only 3 will be less than 17 years old, to wit, the *New Hampshire*, the *Michigan*, and the *South Carolina*. (U. S. Navy Yearbook, 1914, p. 854.)

NOTE.—December 25, 1915. The General Board's report of October 12, 1915, was released for publication three days ago. The very same 25 battleships which Secretary Daniels classes as second-line battleships in 1921 are classified as follows by the General Board: Predreadnaughts, second line, 13; superannuated predreadnaughts, third line, 9; harbor-defense battleships, 3. Total, 25.

The year selected by this General Board happens to be 1922 instead of 1921, but that does not affect the classification. (Report of Secretary of Navy, 1915, pp. 83 and 85.)

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts state what he thinks this Congress ought to do on the subject of making battleships?

Mr. GARDNER. I think that our true policy is to build our Navy into second place, and a strong second place at that, just as quickly as the capacity of our shipyards and the training of officers and men will permit. Ultimately I think that our Navy must be strong enough to meet on even terms such part of the British fleet as can be brought against us at any one time. Even if we are in danger of being swindled in the matter of prices, I believe in going ahead just as fast as we can.

If, as events unfold themselves, there appears to be a real assurance of disarmament after the war, there will be plenty of time to call a halt. By the way, talking of naval disarmament, did it ever occur to you that Great Britain is even further ahead of the rest of the world in her merchant marine than she is in her navy? Suppose that every navy is abolished. In that case Great Britain will, in comparison to other nations, be stronger at sea than ever, for she can easily put guns aboard half her merchant fleet and still do her carrying trade with the remainder.

I am inclined to think that we ought to vote seven or eight new dreadnaughts and battle cruisers this year. As near as I can find out the building capacity of our shipyards, public and private, is adequate for the simultaneous construction of at least 13 of these big capital ships. Of course it would be necessary to build more battleship ways in the yards, but I am told the ways can be constructed in nine months or so. At all events they can be constructed in plenty of time to be ready when the constructors are prepared to lay the keels. It must not be forgotten that three of the battleships already voted by Congress will in all probability not have been launched on January 1, 1917, so that we can not count on the entire capacity of our yards.

THE SNAIL'S PACE.

No matter whether our Navy-building program is big or little, common sense tells us to go ahead on it as fast as possible. That at least is the view of the General Board of the Navy. Secretary Daniels's plan is based on precisely the opposite view.

The Secretary recommends that the appropriation to pay for his new building program shall be divided into five parts, and that in each of the next five years Congress shall vote one of these parts. He then proceeds to recommend that the smallest of these appropriations shall be the one which we are to vote at this session of Congress.

The administration speaks of Secretary Daniels's program as a five-year program. It is nothing of the sort. It takes, to be sure, only five years to vote the program; but four more

years must elapse before the actual shipbuilding is complete. From the date when the construction of a battleship is voted to the date when it is commissioned it is safe to assume that four years will elapse. If we adopt the Secretary's plan, the entire new fleet will not be commissioned, at the earliest, before the summer of 1924.

NAVY BOOKKEEPING.

The Secretary says that his grand total for new construction is \$502,000,000; but an analysis of his figures, on page 7 of his report, shows that in this amount he has included about \$48,000,000 to pay for construction already authorized by Congress. In his recommendation for this year the Secretary has included \$28,000,000 to pay for vessels already provided by Congress or under construction. For actual new construction, then, instead of \$95,000,000 this year, he has recommended only \$67,000,000, and that amount, by the way, includes the provision for reserve ammunition and the aviation service of the Navy. It seems to me that if we are going to have a new construction program we ought not to charge in \$28,000,000 worth of old construction.

CREWS.

Mr. Speaker, I think that 20,000 men added to the Navy would probably at the present moment be more valuable than three times that number added to the Army. But Secretary Daniels does not suggest the addition of anywhere near 20,000 men. Yet Admiral Badger and Assistant Secretary Franklin D. Roosevelt testified last year before the Naval Affairs Committee that we were eighteen to twenty thousand men short. (Naval bill hearings, December, 1914, pp. 482, 951.) The Secretary now comes before us and he says that next year he will need 7,500 more men and 2,500 more apprentices. That is the additional number of men which he requests for the Navy proper, and for the Marine Corps he asks an increase of 1,500 men. When there is so much difference of view between Secretary Daniels and the Navy experts, it is almost imperative that Congress should find out what the average officer of the Navy thinks about the matter. We want to hear from men outside the department's sphere of influence.

You will find out about the shortages of men in Admiral Fletcher's fleet if you call for his report of August 15, 1915, and insist upon having it.

ARMY PLANS.

I have very little time to-day to discuss the proposed increase in the Army. There are several different plans, and there are more coming, I am told. There is the plan known as the "Garrison plan"; there is the plan known as the "Glenn plan," supposed to have been drawn up by Col. Glenn, of the Army. Then there is Senator CHAMBERLAIN's plan and the plan favored by Congressman HAY, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House. There is the War College plan, which was sent to your offices the other day. I am not going into the difference between those plans. The War College plan calls for a Regular Army of 281,000 officers and men, all told. (Statement of Army War College, September, 1915, p. 21.) The Garrison plan calls for 141,843 officers and men, all told. (Report of Secretary of War, 1915, p. 24.) Both plans call for a continental army—400,000 men in the Garrison plan and 500,000 men in the War College plan.

I am not prepared to give you my opinion of these various plans to-day. I am seriously anxious to see something done in the way of practical legislation, even if it does not entirely meet my own views. If I can not get a full loaf I shall be forced to take half a loaf. That is all there is to it.

PAYING THE BILL.

Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Ways and Means Committee. I think it quite in the cards that a plan may be afoot to prevent the report out of that committee of a bill to finance the proposed increases of our Army and Navy. Some people believe that the Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee will say, "We shall not vote to report a bill raising revenue for your increased military and naval expenses unless that bill provides that the revenue shall be raised by a higher protective tariff." With the Democrats on that committee who are against a greater Army and Navy added to the Republicans who are insistent on tariff legislation, the wiseacres think they can see a majority of the Committee on Ways and Means against any new revenue bill at all. I can not speak for any other Republican member of the committee, but if the pacifists are counting on me to countenance such a plan they are quite mistaken. I may not like the kind of bill which you Democrats will frame in the Ways and Means Committee. If so, I shall try to improve it, which, of course, I shall not be able to do; If, however, that bill is designed for the purpose of paying for an increased Army and Navy, and if the alternative is no reve-

nue bill at all and therefore no increases, I shall vote to report your bill out of committee.

DOCUMENTS WHICH CONGRESS SHOULD INSIST ON HAVING.

I am going to ask this House by resolution, if necessary, to call for the report of the General Board of the Navy, made in reply to the President's directions that an adequate naval program should be formulated. That report is dated July 30, 1915. You must get that July 30, 1915, report if you wish the real opinion of the General Board of the Navy.

Admiral Fletcher is commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet. You must require Admiral Fletcher's report of August 15, 1915, if you wish to know the true state of our Navy at the present moment. Furthermore, you must insist on having his confidential order of February 13, 1913, if you desire to get track of the target-practice question. You must call for the letter of the General Board of the Navy to the Secretary of the Navy, written August 3, 1914, if you wish to get the opinion of the General Board of the Navy as to the necessity of our immediate preparation lest we be involved in this European war.

[NOTE.—December 25, 1915. The July 30, 1915, report of the General Board of the Navy was made public to-day.]

CONCLUSION.

Here are some lines written by one of the gentlest writers of American verse, Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, the benevolent "Poet at the Breakfast Table":

NONRESISTANCE.

Perhaps too far in these considerate days
Has patience carried her submissive ways;
Wisdom has taught us to be calm and meek,
To take one blow and turn the other cheek;
It is not written what a man shall do
If the rude caiff smite the other, too!
Land of our fathers, in thine hour of need
God help thee, guarded by the passive creed!
As the lone pilgrim trusts to beads and cowl,
When through the forest rings the gray wolf's howl;
As the deep galleon trusts her gilded prow
When the black corsair slants athwart her bow;
As the poor pheasant, with his peaceful mien,
Trusts to his feathers, shining golden-green,
When the dark plumage with the crimson beak
Has rustled shadowy from its splintered peak,
So trust thy friends, whose babbling tongues would charm
The lifted saber from thy foe's arm,
Thy torches ready for the answering peal
From bellowing fort and thunder-freighted keel!

APPENDIX.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF PREPAREDNESS.

[Extract from the annual report of Hon. L. M. Garrison, Secretary of War, November, 1915.]

The necessity of a nation having force commensurate with its responsibility is demonstrated by every correct process of reasoning founded upon fact. This is so whether the subject is considered in the light of the philosophy of government or of history. The use of force is the inherent essence of government. The very term itself is explicit—government, the right or power to compel obedience to law. Where there is no force to compel such obedience—that is, to govern—there is anarchy. Individuals give up the right of unregulated action when they form themselves into or become subject to a government. The progress and advancement of that which is summed up in the word "civilization" have been made possible solely because of government. Unless the individual is secure in his person and his property he has neither time nor inclination to devote himself to the cultivation of the mental, moral, or spiritual side of his nature. That security is assured to him by government, and government can only meet its responsibility of assurance by the possession of sufficient force to secure and preserve it. In our own earlier days the continued progress of the arts of peace was constantly interrupted by the necessity of banding together to prevent destruction by aggression from without. Later, and even after many of our largest civil communities were established, the individual citizen had to be prepared to protect himself, his family and his property, against the depredations of criminals, until the community organized and prepared a police force sufficient to assure the citizen of protection.

The identical necessity exists as to the nation. Unless the citizens thereof are assured that they can cultivate the arts of peace behind a barrier of force which will protect them from aggression and secure them in their rights, they are not free to cultivate such arts. Alike in the case of the individual, the internal municipality, and the nation, there must be a realization of the responsibility and a willingness and preparation to measure up to and meet it. This is equally true in respect to the threefold aspects of men and nations—physical, mental, and spiritual. Strength of mind, of body, and of spirit are prerequisites for progress along right lines. The essential basis of civilization is maintained by the triumph of what is right over what is wrong, and its progress can only be continued and assured so long as those who sustain the right are stronger than those who assert the wrong. Weakness inevitably results in overthrow, as the abundant instances of history demonstrate, both with respect to individuals, cities, and nations. The eye that is not diverted will see this, and the mind that is free from prejudice will grasp and realize it. It is necessary, therefore, to remove obstructions to clear vision and prejudice to clear thinking.

There are some who do not feel free to base their conduct upon a consideration of facts or conclusions of reason because of their interpretation of divine injunction. They do not believe in resistance to physical force, and those whose consciences are so convinced surrender life and all that they cherish and love at the behest of the aggressor. This attitude concerns the individual and him alone. Since it does not assume to be based upon fact or reason, it can not be dealt with on

that basis. It can not be made the general rule of conduct under our form of government without departing from the basis upon which our Government is founded. Our Government is enjoined by the law of its being to use whatever force is necessary to protect the rights of the citizen. Before leaving this one is impelled to query upon what proper consideration there is based any distinction between the right or necessity or desirability of using mental force to repel error, moral force to repel evil, and physical force to repel wrong. It would seem, if reason were applied, that in each instance the situation is identical, and that if we should properly prepare our minds to be strong so that we can reject error and our moral characters to be strong so that we can reject evil we should likewise make our physical force strong in order that we may maintain the right as against those who would physically impose the wrong upon us.

There are others concerning whose clarity of vision we are not advised and concerning whose soundness of reason we are not informed because the attitude which they take is admittedly not based upon either vision or reason. They are those who predict that war will never come to this country, and assert that therefore precautions with respect thereto are unwise and needless. Since wars have come upon nations from the earliest date of recorded history to this moment, there is no basis of fact for such a position but an actual demonstration of the nonexistence of such basis. We were early warned that there would be wars and rumors of wars, and that nation would rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom, and the end was not yet; and that prediction has been fully verified. There is no basis and no foundation to conclude that this great evil has been eliminated, and it therefore must be treated as are all other existing evils and must be prepared against. Surely, as between resting upon prediction or upon preparation, wisdom would not hesitate.

There are others among us who are too intelligent and clear-sighted not to see the facts and to realize their significance, but who counsel inaction because they mistrust themselves and the Nation. Those to whom I now refer do not believe in the doctrine of nonresistance; they do not rest upon the prediction that an evil which has existed since the world began has ceased to exist and been abolished and should not therefore be considered as one to be prepared against; they even point out our potentiality of force, but they counsel against any preparation thereof. They base this counsel upon the expressed fear that if we possess force we will be induced to use it when we should not. This position ignores certain things which are essential to be maintained and is based upon certain assumptions which are not justified. It ignores the responsibilities which we have undertaken and which we must maintain at any self-sacrifice. It ignores the fact that if nations which possess force are likely to use it when they should not, some nation which has such force is likely to use it against us when it should not. It assumes that our Nation may not be trusted with force for fear that it may misuse it. I know of nothing which justifies such an indictment of our people and our Nation.

The eyes of many are blinded to fact and their minds closed to reason by an abhorrence of what they term "militarism," without any actual conception of just what this means or how it should effect the proper consideration of the subject. If by militarism they mean the placing of the military authority over the civil authority, or if they mean that the ordinary processes of government shall in any way be subservient to military authority or influence, no argument is needed to secure unanimity of opinion that this is not only undesirable, but in this country impossible. If they mean, however, that any reasonable, sensible precaution of a military nature is militarism, then they have reached a conclusion without the aid of clear vision or sound reasoning.

Those who really fear militarism, or, more accurately stated, those who dread real militarism, should be the strongest advocates of reasonable preparation. The latter is the preventive of militarism. If they unwisely defeat reasonable preparedness, they leave the country in a condition where the inevitable result of defeat, humiliation, or acute apprehension will be hasty and ill-advised provisions as to armament far beyond anything which calm reason and wise provision would deem necessary.

There will be those who assert that the proposed policy opposes the traditions of the people and runs counter thereto. This is mere assertion; it is not the fact, and in truth the fact is to the contrary. The proposed policy is exactly in keeping with our traditions. Such traditions are for a standing force, small in relation to population, and a trained and equipped force much larger in proportion thereto, but not constantly under arms. This is exactly what the plan proposes.

There will also be those who will express regret that the policy heretofore pursued of lack of proper military precautions is to be departed from, because it has been invaluable as an example to the rest of the world, and should not remedy the lack because we would then cease to be such an example. It should be observed, first, in considering this point of view, that it entirely overlooks the vital and imperative duty to ourselves which requires that we should protect and defend that which we cherish and hold dear. Furthermore, it overlooks the fact that, although we have been just the example that they desire throughout the more than a century and a quarter of our existence, the results existing in the world to-day do not warrant the belief that our example has had any beneficial effect.

There are some who decry taking any precautions or making any preparations of the military power of the Nation because they say it will not prevent war, but will provoke it. Taking up the last question first, the answer has already been made to this. Men and nations must prepare to meet their responsibilities; if it is inadvisable to develop strength sufficient to repel wrong because such developed strength may be misused, human nature has indeed reached an impasse. Why should it be presumed that a just man or a just nation will cease to be just because it has the power to be unjust? We must either trust others or trust ourselves.

As to preparation for war preventing war, that misstates the position of the sensible advocate of preparedness. It is not asserted that it prevents it, but it is asserted that it tends to prevent it, and in many instances has been demonstrated to have prevented it. The military force prepared by the municipality—that is, the police—does not prevent crime, but it tends to prevent it, and it undoubtedly minimizes the aggressions of the wrongdoer against the lives and property of the rightdoer.

So long as right and wrong exist in the world there will be an inevitable conflict between them. The right-doers must be prepared to protect and defend the right as against the wrong. Their preparation will tend to prevent the triumph of wrong; and in those instances in which it does not prevent the attempt it can prevent the success of the attempt.

Somewhat in the same vein is the insistence of those who say "I will not consent to the Nation having arms until I know against whom

it intends to use them." Identical reasoning would result in saying "I will not place a club or revolver in the hands of a policeman until he tells me the name of the criminal he intends to use them upon," or, "I will not agree to prepare fire apparatus unless you point out where the fires are going to be." Wisdom demands precaution; precaution demands preparation; preparation is against the day of evil from any quarter.

If the only protection against evil was such as was undertaken after the evil was upon us there would be constant and steady retrogression in human affairs.

Another stumbling block to some is the suggestion that no preparation should be made and no precaution should be taken because no one can foretell how much we may have to meet and what we will require to meet it. Here again the idea embodied in this suggestion would stay all human progress. No one can foretell the future with accuracy with respect to anything in human life. Health, wealth, outbursts of nature, and human outbreaks—no one can surely foretell anything concerning them. If we should not prepare ourselves reasonably with respect to these things because we can not be sure that we have protected ourselves against all conceivable possibilities, we would be deliberately choosing the path of folly and not that of wisdom. The two extremes of any proposition are the foolish ones; the reasonable mean is the wise one.

There will be some who assert that the devastating effects and the horror produced by the war now being waged make it certain that war will be avoided for a long period of time after the close of the present war. They will argue that the exhaustion of resources and the recollection of the awful suffering will have the effect of deterring nations from entering upon war.

What basis is there for such belief? Certainly such basis can not be found in history—our own or that of other nations.

The colonists had barely passed through the exhaustive and devastating wars with the Indians before they engaged in the Revolution. That war was surely as exhausting to our meager resources and as productive of horrible conditions as can well be imagined, and yet within a very short time after its close we were on the verge of war with two of the greatest nations of the world, and finally went to war with one of them.

The War between the States had every element of exhaustion and every untoward effect which war produces, and yet at its close we took a position in support of the Monroe doctrine which would inevitably have brought on war with one of the great nations of the world if it had not yielded to our insistence.

History literally abounds with examples. Without going further back than the era of the Napoleonic wars, we find that the strain upon resources and the horrors produced by war did not result in the avoidance of war. Probably as striking an example as any is the most recent—the Balkan States have engaged in two wars within three years, straining their material resources to the utmost and attended by all the horror that war produces, and, notwithstanding that, some of them are already engaged in the present war and there is much discussion as to whether others will not also be so engaged.

The only conclusion that can possibly be drawn from the facts is that there is no justification for the belief that because there has been war there will be no more war.

There will be those who believe and assert that the time when war can be avoided by negotiation or arbitration or other like means will be advanced if we refrain from adopting a proper military policy, but will be set back if we do so. It is difficult to comprehend on what basis such a belief can reasonably rest, and therefore it is difficult to reason about it. It seems to rest upon the idea that if we are feeble and weak in action we will be strong and persuasive in counsel; that by avowedly neglecting to prepare to protect our rights we will be the better able to secure their protection by appeal, by arbitration, or by argument. This is not so in any analogous case, saving only that in which the patronizing recognition of weakness induces the strong to abstain from assaulting the weak. In all other instances he who has taken up his burden in a manly way, has seen his duty and has done it, is the one who realizes the necessity of justice, insists upon its being meted out to others, and secures it for himself. No one need have the slightest fear that our voice for peaceful settlement of the quarrels of nations will receive any the less attention because we stand for the right and are prepared to maintain it at any proper cost. On the contrary, the voice of such a one is always listened to and usually controls.

There will be some who approach the subject from the wrong end, and who, by failing to take the proper steps, fail to reach the proper conclusion. Without any accurate knowledge of the causes, they will point to the aggregate of cost, and by failing to consider the necessity of incurring the cost they will fail to appreciate its necessity. Primarily it is true that when a matter is considered from the standpoint of responsibility no one has a right to count the cost. An individual or a nation who has undertaken a responsibility or duty must measure up to it in the fullest spirit of self-sacrifice. But without necessity of resorting to such radical considerations, it is obvious that any necessary cost of government is not only justified but imperative. The first consideration, therefore, should be, Has the nation a responsibility and a duty in this respect? If it has, what is necessary in order that it should take the means commensurate with such duty or responsibility? Secondly, what is the proper cost of taking such means? And, thirdly, how shall we secure that which supplies the means?

In this connection it is essential to keep certain things constantly in mind. In countries where the service of the individual is required by the nation in the same way that his money is required of him by taxation the cost to the nation is minimized and is largely occasioned by the purchase of material supplies. It is likewise true that the standard of living is much higher in this country than elsewhere; that rent, fuel, clothing, food, and other necessities of life are higher, just as wages and salaries are. It should also be remembered that the vast territory and the small number of troops therein increase the cost of transportation here over its cost elsewhere to a very great amount. Comparisons between the cost of a military establishment in this country and in any other country are not only useless but harmful and misleading if they fail to take into account and accurately determine the effect of the matters just referred to upon the totals in the respective nations concerned.

Any present consideration of the subject of military policy requires us to recognize that at this time the people of the country believe that a safe reliance can be placed upon their patriotism, and that it is not necessary to resort to compulsory requirements to provide assurance for the Nation's safety.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. KELLEY. To ask unanimous consent for a couple of minutes to make a statement relative to the degree of completion of the submarines already authorized, in order that it may follow the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] asks unanimous consent for two minutes in order to make a statement in regard to submarines, notwithstanding the special order. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, there are at the present time 39 submarines authorized. Some have not yet been begun. There is one ship, authorized in 1911, which has not yet been completed. There are eight ships, authorized in 1912, that have not yet been delivered, but it is expected that they will be delivered early in 1916. There are five ships, authorized in 1913, that are in various degrees of completion, but it is not expected they will be delivered until 1917. There are seven ships, authorized in 1914, and they are expected to be delivered at various times through 1917 and 1918. There are 16 ships, authorized on the 3d of March, 1915, none of which have yet been begun. In addition are the two seagoing submarines authorized in March, 1915, which have not yet been contracted for; making a total of 39 submarines authorized, but either not yet begun or in various stages of completion.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield there? Can the gentleman tell us why the completion of those is so long delayed? Why could they not be completed within a year?

Mr. KELLEY. I want to say to the gentleman from North Dakota I do not know. I asked the gentleman from Massachusetts if he knew of any reason why these ships could not be completed more rapidly, and the gentleman from North Dakota heard what the gentleman from Massachusetts said in reply.

Mr. NORTON. Have appropriations been made for those vessels?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized, under the special order of the House, for one hour.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks I want to take the House into my confidence. I had not intended to make a speech on preparedness at this time. I had not thought particularly of making a speech on preparedness at any time, though I have some very definite views with regard to the matters that are embraced in that all-embracing term. When, however, the other day the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] asked and obtained time to talk on that subject, and I realized that what they said, as entered in that entertaining family journal, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, would go to the people during the Christmas holidays containing the views they held, it occurred to me that perhaps other and somewhat different views ought to be voiced, in order that the very few people who do read the RECORD might know that there were some differences of opinion on the subject in the House. It follows, therefore, that what little preparation I have made, and it has been limited, has been made in the last couple of days in the midst of other duties, and I apologize to the House, for this is so important a question that one ought not discuss it at length without a good deal of thought and preparation.

I am for preparedness. I want to thank the Speaker for the word "reasonable" as a qualifying adjective. I am for "reasonable" preparedness, and, being for preparedness, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has rather discouraged me, and after hearing him I enter upon my discussion in a rather disturbed frame of mind, for, as I understand it, he tells us that although we have expended in 12 years \$1,331,821,032 on our Navy, to-day we have a Navy whose fastest ships are slower than the slowest ships upon which the nations now at war are depending and have actually used in this awful struggle; and although we have been all these years building submarines, and were really the people who first began to build them, we have but one that can dive. [Laughter.] And while Americans were the inventors and first promoters of the flying machine, we have only a measly half dozen that can fly. And being for preparedness, praying God that my country may be prepared, you can imagine the frame of mind I am in when I think of how little we have, in the opinion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, for all the millions we have expended.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Amen! [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Well, of course I do not altogether agree with my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. I am rather inclined to think that the Navy and every factor of it would give a good account of itself if it were brought into conflict with a foreign navy. I can think of no subject with regard to which it is so important that it shall be discussed in a spirit of nonpartisanship. That being so, I am thankful that the leaders of our party in the House and Senate have assured the country that this great question of national defense will be discussed from a nonpartisan standpoint and without partisan feeling, so far as we can prevent that sort of thing creeping into our discussion. And because I believe this question should be considered without partisanship, I am delighted that I am able to say that I agree very largely—very largely, indeed—with the substance of what has been said by the President of the United States on this great question of preparation. [Applause.]

My agreement, however, is not with what the President said on December 6, 1915, but with what he said on December 8, 1914. [Applause.] I will never forget those words, for they were splendid, manly words. The language was that fine, clear-cut, beautiful English of which the President is a master. At the close of that message I said to a friend, "I have only one criticism of what the President has said, or of his having said it, and that is it seems to me the President has set up a straw man and then proceeded to demolish it, for surely nowhere within the Republic are there any considerable number of people who would propose or suggest a plan of militarism and bristling, stupendous armament such as he warned us against." Possibly some of the gentlemen who were here on that occasion have forgotten what was then said. Some gentlemen were not here then who are here to-day, and with your permission I will read a few of the patriotic words of the President, delivered to the Congress of the United States on the 8th day of December, 1914. The President, after having discussed a variety of subjects, finally, in closing, said he would refer to two, the question of economy in expenditures and the question, then agitating the country, of preparedness. After discussing the question of economy he said:

The other topic I shall take leave to mention goes deeper into the principles of our national life and policy. It is the subject of national defense.

It can not be discussed without first answering some very searching questions. It is said in some quarters that we are not prepared for war. What is meant by being prepared? Is it meant that we are not ready upon brief notice to put a nation in the field, a nation of men trained to arms? Of course we are not ready to do that; and we shall never be in time of peace so long as we retain our present political principles and institutions. And what is it that it is suggested we should be prepared to do? To defend ourselves against attack? We have always found means to do that, and shall find them whenever it is necessary without calling our people away from their necessary tasks to render compulsory military service in times of peace.

Allow me to speak with great plainness and directness upon this great matter and to avow my convictions with deep earnestness. I have tried to know what America is, what her people think, what they are, what they most cherish and hold dear. I hope that some of their finer passions are in my own heart—some of the great conceptions and desires which gave birth to this Government and which have made the voice of this people a voice of peace and hope and liberty among the peoples of the world, and that, speaking my own thoughts, I shall, at least in part, speak theirs also, however faintly and inadequately, upon this vital matter.

We are at peace with all the world. No one who speaks counsel based on fact or drawn from a just and candid interpretation of realities can say that there is reason to fear that from any quarter our independence or the integrity of our territory is threatened. Dread of the power of any other nation we are incapable of. We are not jealous of rivalry in the fields of commerce or of any other peaceful achievement. We mean to live our own lives as we will; but we mean also to let live. We are, indeed, a true friend to all the nations of the world, because we threaten none, covet the possessions of none, desire the overthrow of none. Our friendship can be accepted and is accepted without reservation, because it is offered in a spirit and for a purpose which no one need ever question or suspect. Therein lies our greatness. We are the champions of peace and of concord. And we should be very jealous of this distinction which we have sought to earn. Just now we should be particularly jealous of it, because it is our dearest present hope that this character and reputation may presently, in God's providence, bring us an opportunity such as has seldom been vouchsafed any nation—the opportunity to counsel and obtain peace in the world and reconciliation and a healing settlement of many a matter that has cooled and interrupted the friendship of nations. This is the time above all others when we should wish and resolve to keep our strength by self-possession, our influence by preserving our ancient principles of action.

The President then went on to discuss certain matters relating to our naval policy and the National Guard, and then proceeded as follows:

More than this carries with it a reversal of the whole history and character of our polity. More than this, proposed at this time, permit me to say, would mean merely that we had lost our self-possession; that we had been thrown off our balance by a war with which we have nothing to do, whose causes can not touch us, whose very existence affords us opportunities of friendship and disinterested service which should make us ashamed of any thought of hostility or fearful prepara-

tion for trouble. This is assuredly the opportunity for which a people and a government like ours were raised up, the opportunity not only to speak but actually to embody and exemplify the counsels of peace and amity and the lasting concord which is based on justice and fair and generous dealing.

[Applause.]

Then the President said that he turned from this subject—that it was not new; that there was really no need of discussing it; that "we shall not alter our attitude toward these things," and closed with the admonition, "Let there be no misconception. The country has been misinformed. We have not been negligent of national defense. We are not unmindful of the great responsibility that rests upon us." The President closed his message with the following paragraph:

I close, as I began, by reminding you of the great tasks and duties of peace, which challenge our best powers and invite us to build what will last, the tasks to which we can address ourselves now and at all times with free-hearted zest and with all the finest gifts of constructive wisdom we possess. To develop our life and our resources; to supply our own people, and the people of the world as their need arises, from the abundant plenty of our fields and our marts of trade; to enrich the commerce of our own States and of the world with the products of our mines, our farms, and our factories, with the creations of our thought and the fruits of our character—this is what will hold our attention and our enthusiasm steadily, now and in the years to come, as we strive to show in our life as a nation what liberty and the inspirations of an emancipated spirit may do for men and for societies, for individuals, for states, and for mankind.

That was the view of the President a year ago. Since that time the war in Europe has widely extended its area. Frightful and appalling happenings, blotting out the lives of many of our citizens, and acts on the part of belligerent Governments destructive of our commerce, have brought us into trying diplomatic relationship with several of the warring powers. A considerable part of our industrial and commercial activities have been diverted from their usual and normal channels and turned to the processes of making and supplying the instruments and instrumentalities of war. Out of this war business have grown mushroom fortunes. Its development has been attended by feverish speculation, incredible stock inflation, and all of the unhealthy and regrettable brood of influences and tendencies which such blood merchandising always produces.

Out of the excitement, fever, and hysteria of the times has come every imaginable form, plan, purpose, and propaganda of extension, expansion, and enlargement of military establishments. It is a time when we may well recall Kipling's prayerful refrain:

O Lord of hosts be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget!

In the midst of the conditions I have described and out of the atmosphere which they produce, we have recently heard a message from the President profoundly differing in tone and temper from his utterances of a year ago. The President reminds us that the European war "has swept within its flame" some portion of our own hemisphere, but he assures us that he has "no thought of any immediate or particular danger arising out of our relations with other nations," and expresses a confident hope "that no question in controversy between this and other Governments will lead to any serious breach of amicable relations." And yet in these conditions of safety and of confident hope of peace, present and future, the President, in his message of December 7, at the opening of this Congress, outlined and recommended a military and naval program of vast dimensions and involving tremendous expenditures, a program the like of which has, so far as I can now recall, never been heretofore suggested, much less approved or recommended, by anyone occupying a responsible civil position in the Nation. A program which, had it been presented to him a year ago, would, I am quite confident, have been instantly and emphatically spurned by the President. Had it been suggested at any time by a Republican occupying a position of responsibility and authority it would have met, in the severest terms, the instant and unanimous condemnation of practically every Democrat in the land.

THE COST OF THE PROGRAM.

The revolutionary character of the President's proposal can perhaps be more quickly grasped by a consideration of its cost than of the items which constitute its framework. The carrying out of the plan would necessitate estimated increased expenditures, over our present large expenditures for military purposes, amounting in five years to approximately \$725,000,000, or a total expenditure for military purposes of over \$2,000,000,000. This would be followed by an estimated annual expenditure of \$265,000,000 for the Navy and \$162,000,000 for the Army, or \$427,000,000 annually for military purposes. Inasmuch as the sum estimated for the Army at the end of the five-year period is \$56,000,000 less than the sum estimated for the fourth year of the program, we have so good an authority as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], the chair-

man of the Committee on Appropriations, in a recent article in the North American Review, that this reduction is not likely to be realized; and, further, when we take into consideration the fact that additional and supplemental estimates are already coming in, and that first estimates of this sort are uniformly notoriously low, we may conservatively estimate the expenditure for military purposes alone, under the President's plan, of at least \$500,000,000 per annum. That is more than the total net annual expenditures of the Government for all purposes up to about 10 years ago. It is considerably more than double our average annual expenditure for the past 10 years for military purposes. It is approximately three times the sum which Germany has been expending annually the last 12 years on her vast army and her navy. With the amount of money thus proposed to be absorbed for military purposes, we could build five Panama Canals every four years.

France and Germany have been held up to the children in our schools ever since we can remember as horrible examples of a republic and a monarchy burdened with militarism, and our President proposes we shall spend three times as much as they have been spending for military purposes.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Of course the gentleman knows that the difference in the pay roll of the German Navy and the German Army alone is very great, and that we expend \$27,000,000 a year more in pay, does he not? I am not speaking of pay in the navy yards, I am speaking just of the pay of the men in the fleet.

Mr. MONDELL. I realize that the difference in cost of both our Army and Navy is largely due to the difference in the pay; that in Switzerland a soldier receives practically no pay; that in Germany he receives about \$2 a month and in France something less. The very fact that the shadow of other enormous military establishments compels those people, in their opinion, to submit to this grinding militarism, which our people would not tolerate for a moment, is one of the strongest reasons why we should stop and consider when we propose to enter on such a plan. Is it your idea that the boys of America will serve for a few cents a day? Aye, freely, if necessary, when a foe invades, and to the extent of millions, but never in the piping times of peace.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment. Does the gentleman recall that we spent a round \$1,000,000,000 in 12 years on our Navy, which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] thinks so slow and inadequate, more than Germany spent on hers, which now huddles cowering and shivering behind the fortifications of Heligoland.

Mr. HENSLEY. Do you think the difference in the pay of the men makes up that amount?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I am not sure about that. I think perhaps the gentleman from Missouri, who is a member of the Naval Committee, is better informed on that than I am. It is the biggest item. There are some other important items, but it is the largest.

In the Bulgarian Army officers of the lower grades receive about the same amount we pay a raw recruit in the ranks. A brigadier general receives about what we pay a captain.

I think it may illuminate the subject somewhat to place in the RECORD the figures of expenditures of the leading nations of Europe for military purposes for the 12 years prior to the outbreak of the European war compared with ours. They are as follows:

Army and naval expenditures.

| | Germany. | | France. | |
|------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Army. | Navy. | Army. | Navy. |
| 1901..... | \$134,377,394 | \$19,398,951 | \$133,769,906 | \$67,079,011 |
| 1902..... | 135,296,716 | 20,685,413 | 138,088,097 | 59,217,558 |
| 1903..... | 136,910,261 | 22,198,093 | 132,746,026 | 59,740,222 |
| 1904..... | 137,642,159 | 23,769,250 | 130,531,594 | 60,178,623 |
| 1905..... | 141,568,778 | 25,060,233 | 132,173,056 | 61,565,779 |
| 1906..... | 150,561,180 | 27,454,942 | 138,707,340 | 59,516,296 |
| 1907..... | 151,899,477 | 28,761,395 | 150,537,325 | 60,685,813 |
| 1908..... | 159,586,616 | 31,844,661 | 150,515,900 | 62,194,916 |
| 1909..... | 145,394,461 | 34,681,907 | 150,515,865 | 64,899,589 |
| 1910..... | 149,497,486 | 37,113,101 | 168,325,047 | 74,102,439 |
| 1911..... | 150,872,983 | 39,372,030 | 181,065,215 | 80,371,109 |
| 1912..... | 162,835,530 | 43,715,102 | 177,656,237 | 81,692,832 |
| Total..... | 1,756,453,041 | 354,055,078 | 1,774,631,558 | 789,242,168 |
| Grand total..... | 2,110,508,119 | | 2,563,873,726 | |

Army and naval expenditures—Continued.

| | Great Britain. | | United States. | |
|------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| | Army. | Navy. | Army. | Navy. |
| 1901..... | \$447,929,623 | \$145,732,580 | \$144,615,097 | \$82,477,643 |
| 1902..... | 450,331,847 | 150,769,190 | 112,272,216 | 85,137,123 |
| 1903..... | 434,576,741 | 150,678,207 | 118,619,520 | 84,672,048 |
| 1904..... | 478,561,683 | 173,548,058 | 115,035,411 | 103,633,115 |
| 1905..... | 440,432,732 | 180,037,952 | 122,175,074 | 115,420,997 |
| 1906..... | 438,407,474 | 161,117,947 | 117,946,692 | 104,508,719 |
| 1907..... | 428,516,903 | 152,954,342 | 122,578,465 | 99,093,298 |
| 1908..... | 431,968,380 | 151,880,618 | 137,746,524 | 129,974,371 |
| 1909..... | 420,736,193 | 156,400,161 | 161,067,462 | 130,216,545 |
| 1910..... | 432,404,889 | 173,659,312 | 155,911,706 | 133,555,532 |
| 1911..... | 433,891,526 | 176,436,972 | 160,135,976 | 127,026,107 |
| 1912..... | 434,390,402 | 176,133,389 | 148,795,422 | 126,405,503 |
| Total..... | 2,486,126,900 | 1,981,209,088 | 1,616,888,165 | 1,331,821,032 |
| Grand total..... | 4,467,335,888 | | 2,948,719,197 | |

Total Army expenditures, 1901-1912.

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| United States..... | \$1,616,888,165 |
| Germany..... | 1,756,453,041 |
| France..... | 1,774,631,558 |
| Great Britain..... | 2,486,126,900 |

Total naval expenditures, 1901-1912.

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| United States..... | \$1,331,821,032 |
| Germany..... | 354,055,078 |
| France..... | 789,242,168 |
| Great Britain..... | 1,981,209,088 |

Grand totals for Army and Navy, 1901-1912.

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| United States..... | \$2,948,719,197 |
| Germany..... | 2,110,508,119 |
| France..... | 2,563,873,726 |
| Great Britain..... | 4,467,335,888 |

As all these figures, except those for Great Britain, are for a period of peace, the total for Great Britain should, in order to make the showing a fair one of peace conditions, be reduced by about one and a half billion dollars as the estimated expenditure on account of the Boer War. This would leave her ordinary military expenditures for the period about the same as ours.

I do not quote these staggering figures with the idea that we should neglect necessary or adequate provision for defense on account of cost. If I shared in the fears and forebodings which encompass some of our people in a nightmare of apprehension, I should not hesitate to help appropriate even as vast sums as I have mentioned. I am fortunate in that I am not panicky in my disposition and that none of my constituents deal in war munitions; furthermore, we have the assurance of the President, who ought to know more about it than anyone else, that we are not fronting any impending or probable assault. [Applause.]

WHEN WE ARE TO BE ENGULFED.

The favorite period selected by amateur military strategists and alarmist scribblers for staging the impending military cataclysm that is to engulf us—now that we seem temporarily to have escaped the Japanese peril—is immediately after the close of the European war. The selection by our alarmist friends of this period of exhaustion and impoverishment and weariness of blood letting as the date of our overthrow as a people affords striking evidence of the fact that their fears and their imagination have grown in proportion as their sense of humor has diminished. That time can not be very far distant. It is certain not to be five years hence. It is more likely to be within the neighborhood of five months. Therefore the President, in common with all who are advocating enormous expenditures for dreadnaughts and preparations available five years hence, have aimed their artillery so high that they have completely overshot the mark.

If we stand in the danger that the alarmists claim we do, the great and ambitious military programs running into the distant future are pathetically and ridiculously inadequate to meet the situation and afford us the protection that it is claimed we require. If our situation is as alarming as some seem to think, we need preparation at once; and troops to fully man our fortifications, reserves of field artillery, aerial fleets, submarines, destroyers, and mines for coast and harbor defense, the most effective of all defense material, can be provided in a few months and at a comparatively small cost. If I gave credence to the sinister designs credited by the alarmists to some European powers, I should not want to depend on a limited and uncertain continental army four years hence; I should want a million men at least under arms at once.

If we are confronted with the danger that some of these folks say that we are, and that our good President has unfortunately seemed to catch a glimpse of, great heavens, a continental army five years from now will never save us. [Laughter and ap-

plause.] If I were as trembling and fearful as some folks seem to be, and had the authority, before 24 hours had passed the trumpets would sound and a million men would be called to the colors for immediate defense. If our condition is such as has been suggested by some of the authors of the scare literature that has been so widely and freely circulated, in Heaven's name let us cancel all of the profitable contracts which our folks have with foreign nations, and set them to work turning out artillery, submarines, and aerial fleets now for our defense. [Applause.] If we can build submarines for Germany and Russia and England and have them available before this talk of peace shall crystallize, in Heaven's name why can we not get them for our own use? We can buy and make, if necessary, in six months, more than anybody has claimed we need of field artillery, flying machines, mines, and submarines, and secure the needed force to fully man our splendid coast defenses, and for less outlay than the sum that my friend from Massachusetts fixes as the cost of one or two of these swift heavily armed ships that he wants built and equipped and ready for action from five to eight years from now. [Laughter and applause.]

SUPERDREADNAUGHTS VERSUS DEFENSIVE CRAFT.

I have said, and I repeat, that so far as military preparation and national defense is clearly necessary and imperative we can not stop to count the cost. The President has assured us that not only are we at peace, but we are likely to remain at peace. It is my personal opinion that we would have a hard time getting into war with anybody now or in the near future, were we ever so anxious for a scrap, and for a variety of reasons, which I should be glad to elaborate had I the time.

It is true, however, that the European war has taught us some things, and has clearly suggested others, as to the manner and method of modern warfare, of which we certainly ought to take heed. The most unquestioned of these relates to the increased use of artillery; the most impressive, to the value of mines and submarines and destroyers as weapons of offense and defense, and back of all looms the portentous question as to whether or not the dreadnaught shall, in the future, play a commanding rôle in war.

Why, gentlemen, the mightiest of them all, the most powerful and glorious of England's dreadnaughts, the *Queen Elizabeth*, steamed past Gibraltar's frowning heights to the Dardanelles only to be ingloriously driven back by a Turkish smoothbore. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Do I understand the gentleman to compare the amateur strategists with the naval experts?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, I am an amateur. I admit that.

Mr. GARDNER. So am I.

Mr. MONDELL. I am, however, like the fellow I once knew who, having been criticized for expressing a certain view in regard to a matter to which he had given some thought, said: "I may not know much, I grant that, but what little I do know I know just as well as anybody." [Laughter.]

I do know, and the gentleman from Massachusetts knows, what happened to the *Queen Elizabeth*. She steamed up to the Turkish batteries, but she promptly backed out. She is too valuable to fight. [Laughter and applause.]

The President told us about being too proud to fight. That was some time ago. He now wants ships to be launched a few years from now that are too valuable to be placed in danger. An \$18,000,000 boat costs too much money to be recklessly exposed to hostile gunfire. The sinking of such a ship leaves too big a hole in the battle line, and you can not afford to fight with that kind of a machine. It is a good thing to bluff with. [Laughter.] It uses a lot of the people's money, keeps the munition factories going, and looms large on the sea and in the pages in the naval yearbook. [Applause.]

Referring for a moment to the matter of naval experts, to whom the gentleman from Massachusetts has referred, I recall that in the message of the President, from which I have quoted, he said, among other things:

When will the experts tell us just what kind we should construct, and when will they be right for 10 years together, if the relative efficiency of craft of different kinds and uses continues to change as we have seen it change under our very eyes in these last few months?

Clearly, the President had in his mind at that time, as everyone else had and as a great many people still have, a serious doubt of the effectiveness of dreadnaughts and superdreadnaughts. The *Queen Elizabeth* still keeps out of reach of the Turkish batteries. The German fleet is still seeking safety behind land batteries. The mighty English fleet rides uselessly somewhere, cowering behind a cordon of steel nets and small craft. Only a year ago the naval experts were all for super-

dreadnaughts. Elaborate arguments were made before committees and printed in service journals to prove that one superdreadnaught, by the enormous weight and force of its broadside fire, could smother and crush and sink or put out of commission, in detail, a whole bevy of lighter and smaller ships, even though their guns were as large and their combined strength vastly greater. The very latest pronouncement we have had on the subject from the head of the Navy, and that within the last few days, is that we must depend on the number more than the size of our ships. What has become of all of the convincing arguments of the experts relative to the necessity, the overwhelming advantage, of vast tonnage and size and enormous weight of metal in broadside fire; and how about the change of heart with regard to the battle cruiser, the ship that is to cost \$18,000,000, according to my friend from Massachusetts.

An \$18,000,000 dreadnaught is the picture that rises in the minds of a lot of people, when they think of preparedness. The humble but terrible submarine, the effective flying machine, the deadly mine, those things which you can get quickly and cheaply do not appeal to them. They do not cost enough. [Laughter.] Their manufacture would not keep all the factories at work. While I am anxious to have the factories working, I am not in favor of their working on that class of merchandise.

While I have very serious doubts of the necessity of any considerable expansion of our naval and military establishments, I shall support, as I always have, a reasonable program—what I think is a reasonable program. That is what I have done in the last 20 years. I shall go just as far as I feel that it is proper and right and necessary to do, in view of the kind of people we are and of the conditions that surround us.

I have always supported a program for a steady and uniform development of the Navy. In that respect my record is very different from that of certain gentlemen who are now approving vast increases. In the present state of affairs, with the uncertainty which exists in the mind of almost everyone, except a few experts, as to the character of the big ship of the future and in view of the fact that big ships can not, in any event, judging from our past record, be completed in less than three to six years, I should be inclined to halt the big-ship program as to new authorizations, to hurry forward work on those already authorized and building and turn our attention to small craft which can be quickly built and which the history of the European war has proven can effectively protect our coasts against the near approach of battleships or troop ships. If the large number of submarines already authorized—some 40, I think, have been referred to by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY]—were speedily built and such additional number as is deemed advisable, we need have no fear of attack, particularly if we utilize mines as effectively as they have been utilized in the European war zone.

I did not believe it was advisable to fortify the Panama Canal. I believed, and I still believe, that the canal would be safer without fortifications. Congress took another view of it, and I have voted for the fortifications and for the necessary expenditure for the housing of a garrison. Congress having, apparently with the approval of the country, provided for the fortification and the garrisoning of the canal, we must add, as I suggested at the time would be necessary, several thousand men to our Army to provide for the Panama garrison. There seems to be general approval of a goodly garrison in Hawaii. That will call for some addition to our regular establishment. Our coast defenses, the splendid character of which is clearly pointed out in the recent report of the Chief of Coast Artillery, need several thousand more men for their complete manning. We need a larger air fleet.

All of these things can be provided quickly and without great cost, without any additional expenditure above the average expenditure of the past, if we do not authorize new big ships which may be out of date before they are in commission. We should immediately remedy the foolish mistake, made under this administration, of a long-term enlistment in the Army and provide for a comparatively brief term of enlistment, which will give us a better class of recruits, and if we discourage reenlistment will furnish us a considerable number of trained men available in time of necessity. President Wilson's continental army will not, in my opinion, meet the approval of any considerable number on either side of this House.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Cox). Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. BORLAND. Am I right in believing that the gentleman will continue to support Fort D. A. Russell? [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is eminently right, because Fort D. A. Russell is a splendid post, and, contrary to the views of gold-laced fellows who every time they go to one of Wilhelm's reviews of a hundred thousand men in a bunch want that kind of thing at home, and in spite of the fact that they want to put all of the troops near the big cities, I still believe the place to keep them in is in the posts throughout the country, and Fort D. A. Russell is one of the best. [Laughter.]

AN INVASION THAT IS CERTAIN.

But turning our thoughts from this fear of armed invasion, let us recall that there is another invasion that is impending, the certainty of which is not denied by anyone who has given thought to it. That invasion has been discussed within the last 24 hours by the Secretary of Commerce of this administration. It is an invasion that is certain to come upon us at the end of this war, an invasion of the cheaply produced products of the impoverished people of the late warring countries.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. MONDELL. I can not yield. I have not the time. I would like to, but I will yield a little later if I have the time. In preparing in a reasonable way for the armed invasion, which is, in the last degree improbable, will you gentlemen on the other side adopt and accept as an instrument for supplying the sinews of war, supplying them in abundance and without direct burden, a method which will unquestionably protect us from that other invasion of which I speak, the industrial invasion which is impending? Will you do it? Why, of course you will not. I feel confident that whatever program you adopt you will insist on laying the burden of it unfairly, inequitably, directly, and I can not justify myself in having directly or indirectly by any act of mine given you the excuse for laying additional direct burdens in time of peace on an already overburdened people for an expenditure the necessity for which is very questionable. The program which I shall support, which I hope will be a program more for immediate defense than for future offense, will be even more moderate than it otherwise would be, because I know the funds to pay for it will, under your legislation, be levied directly, inequitably, unjustly, on a comparative few of our people.

I do not propose to be put in the position of having voted for enormous expenditures and then having refused to help pay the bills, and I do not approve the President's proposed tax on automobiles, gasoline, bank checks, and other things any more than I do his military program. Therefore, my disposition to be moderate is strengthened by the fact that I do not propose to help give you gentlemen on the Democratic side opportunities to pass from chewing gum to gasoline in laying additional burdens upon our people. If you will agree that whatever you raise will be raised at the customhouses, making the importer pay for the preparedness you say is necessary against his evil intent, making the foreigner pay for the preparedness you provide out of the fear you have of him as a future armed foe, I will be inclined to be a little more liberal in my view of what out of excess of caution it may be well to do.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will yield only for a question, as my time is short. Mr. Speaker, the trouble with a lot of people in this time of war and stress and nervous strain is that they have lost sight of the fact that our defense is, after all, no matter how many battleships we build, how many men we have in arms, not the force ready at any given moment to hurl at an enemy, but the reserve of a hundred million earnest, patriotic, virile citizens. The trouble with all the gentlemen who edit these alarming stories of possible invasion is that they assume that if all the impossible, improbable things they conjure up in their feverish imaginations were to happen, and some great city of the coast were levied upon, the American people from the Pacific to the Atlantic, in all the glorious South and the splendid Mississippi, on the plains and in the mountains, would be so miserably pusillanimous that they would forthwith make terms with the invader. I believe it to be a fact that there is not any nation on this earth, armed and equipped as well as the best of them is or has been, that would dare or that has the slightest purpose of attempting to invade our territory.

I wish I had the words to express the scorn I feel for those yellow-streaked, soft-hearted Americans, those almost treasonable Americans, who write tales of imaginary invasions which, if what they suggest were in any wise possible, would prove us to be the most pusillanimous, spineless, and unworthy folk that ever lived on the face of the earth, instead of being what we are, the most upstanding, individually effective, intensely patriotic, vigorous, and forceful people in the world. Why, even though every city of the coast were laid waste, between the

two oceans we have men enough and resources enough to drive into the sea, beyond the sea, and punish in a way that would never be forgotten to the end of time any people who would dare invade our territory or have the temerity to attempt to conquer us. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, every minute since you left your homes this morning you have been the possible victims of assault, deadly and murderous. There is not a man you have met who could not have armed himself and attempted your life had he been so disposed. It would be just as sensible to talk about arming ourselves and loading ourselves with artillery, because we might be killed any minute, because the land is full of people with the physical power to kill us, as to talk of being constantly prepared for foreign attacks, which gentlemen of lively imagination anticipate or suggest but which are utterly unlikely. When I was a boy and a young man I lived in regions where it was fashionable to pack guns, and some carried them on both hips and under both arms. My recollection is that the fellow who had the most was generally the fellow who got shot. [Applause.] I never carried any, and I am still here.

THE PAN AMERICAN PLEA.

The President largely predicates his plea for enormous armies and armament on an elaborately developed argument as to the importance of defending this hemisphere against possible encroachments by monarchical powers. The enormous and expensive establishments he proposes and approves he views as a sort of Monroe doctrine, Pan American crusading force. Assuming for the sake of argument that there may be some possible danger of the war-exhausted nations of Europe discovering an inclination, or finding an excuse for violating our sister republics on this hemisphere, are the American people prepared for a continuous expenditure of \$500,000,000 to guard against that possibility?

On the other hand, what will Pan America think about it? The entire spasm of frightful anticipation which seems to possess some of our people is based on a suspicion or a belief that a certain nation of Europe, with whom we have never had a quarrel; a nation which, notwithstanding the excesses of some of her military commanders, is composed of enlightened, humane, and Christian people; a nation whose proper and legitimate ambitions in no wise conflict with ours, is suddenly, out of victory or from the ashes of defeat, to pounce upon us, destroy our cities, and levy on our wealth.

If we have reached the time and condition when our national policies are built on such fantastic and unworthy suspicions and assumptions as that, what may we expect South and Central America will think of our vast preparation and expenditure, ostensibly for their protection and defense? Our Latin-American friends have not all of them at all times been fully convinced of our peaceful and altruistic intentions toward them. What may we expect of them when they see our vast military preparations? They could find no reason, I grant you, in the present purpose or intention of any American to feel alarmed, but what an unhappy outcome it would be if, having armed and equipped ourselves to protect the Americas, as the President would have us, we frightened all America into arming and equipping against some possible future inclination, developed when we found ourselves with a costly military establishment and a growing itching to use it. The plan now proposed might well lead to a duplication on this continent and in this hemisphere of the conditions of armed and bristling militarism which have burdened, impoverished, and brutalized Europe.

I still hope that out of the suffering, misery, and impoverishment of the present European war there will come a desire and disposition to put a limit to the mad race for the upbuilding of military establishments. If it does, how important that we shall not, when these matters are considered, be in the midst of the development of ambitious military programs. If the war should not have that result, but should enthrone the military idea, rob the nations of conscience, and inspire them with a wicked desire for conquest, then the programs that have been proposed are all of them pitifully inadequate. If such a condition arose, universal compulsory service would be necessary, and our war outlay would run into billions annually. I am not willing to believe that such a condition is possible. In the meantime, whatever we do, let us do it strictly on a basis of defense, and quick defense at that.

Let us not forget that we are a people of peace, and that we hope when around the council table at the close of this war the question of disarmament shall be discussed it can not be said in favor of the maintenance of awful military burdens throughout the world that the great Republic of the west, secure in her strength, as all the world knows she is, is leading the world in feverish preparation for war. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. GARDNER. To ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech delivered by Hon. L. C. DYER, a Member of this House, and commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans, at the laying of the corner stone of the William McKinley Memorial at Niles, Ohio, on the 20th of last month. The speech is upon the subject of national defense.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech of the Hon. LEONIDAS C. DYER, at the laying of the corner stone of the William McKinley Memorial at Niles, Ohio. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of preparedness for the national defense.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the national defense. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

WAR REVENUE ACT.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] asks unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, in the course of debate on the joint resolution to extend the operation of the war-revenue act, there was a good deal of criticism directed against the form of financial statement now made by the Treasury Department. Some of this comment was fair and perfectly admissible, involving a reasonable difference of opinion with the accountants of the Treasury Department as to the method of bookkeeping which prevails there. Some of the comment, on the other hand, was utterly unfair—it might almost be said to have been vituperative—involving unwarranted aspersions upon the Secretary of the Treasury, charging that member of the Cabinet, implicitly, with an attempt to “juggle” the figures of his department with intent to deceive the public as to the true condition of the Treasury. Of course, Mr. Speaker, if a gentleman has it in mind, as seemed to be the case with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], to give expression to a mood of levity by indulging in sarcastic strictures on a Cabinet minister, he is within his rights; he is at liberty to give free rein to his humor. If another Member has it in mind, as obviously was the case with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], to severely asperse a high public official, why he could not be expected to experience any difficulty in finding words suited to that species of obfuscation. But it does seem to me that the dignity of this House would better be observed, and the fairness of debate respected, if Members would confine themselves to facts and to an orderly discussion of the problems we are sent here to solve.

I shall not affect a knowledge of accounting which I do not possess. I am not an actuary. I know nothing about bookkeeping. I must assume that the gentleman from Iowa had that ticket as a part of his classical course in Oberlin College, for he spoke upon the subject in a most didactic fashion. Nevertheless, I venture to think I have a reasonably clear understanding of plain propositions in ordinary accounting, and in fairness to the Treasury Department I want to put into the RECORD certain statements from experienced accountants, with whose opinions I quite fully agree, as to the method of bookkeeping at the Treasury Department. One of the criticisms made yesterday of two major items in the statement of the Treasury Department was directed to the fund provided for the retirement of the notes of banks which have discontinued or reduced their circulation. The charge, by implication, was that the Secretary of the Treasury had “juggled the figures” as to this item by making a criminal alteration in the method of accounting. Perhaps it would astonish the gentlemen making this aspersion if they were told that what the Secretary of the Treasury had done was to return to a system of accounting from which he had no lawful right to depart and which had prevailed at the Treasury Department for 23 years, under every Republican Secretary of the Treasury

from the incumbency of Harrison to that of Taft, inclusive. Thus the bitter criticism leveled at the present Secretary of the Treasury shot over the head of Mr. McAdoo and found its mark in the person of every Republican Secretary of the Treasury who presided over the department within the last quarter of a century.

The simple fact is, Mr. Speaker, that pretty soon after the advent of the present administration this particular trust-fund item of the Treasury statement, which had been carried as an asset, was altered upon suggestion of a board of efficiency experts assigned to the department by the Civil Service Commission. The alteration, which was in contravention of law, transferred the item to the liability column of the financial statement, where expert accountants generally agree it belongs. The transfer, entirely proper from an accounting point of view, was contrary to the act of Congress passed July 14, 1890.

The Secretary did not know this at the time, and evidently the efficiency experts did not know it. Subsequently the Secretary of the Treasury ascertained the fact, and on the 1st day of October of the current year he gave directions that the statement be changed to the form provided by law, and which had been used at the Treasury Department for 23 years.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a single question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLASS. Certainly I do.

Mr. HILL. It does not make any difference who is right or wrong about that statement, but as a matter of fact ought trust funds belonging to a bank be counted as a part of the available funds of the Treasury?

Mr. GLASS. If the gentleman wants my opinion, I will give it for what it is worth.

Mr. HILL. I do. I value the gentleman's opinion more than the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. GLASS. I thank the gentleman for the compliment; I do not so highly value my judgment. However, I venture to think that trust funds should not be counted as available Treasury funds. Moreover, the efficiency experts of the Civil Service Commission and the committee on efficiency did not think so; they transferred this item to the liability side of the ledger. But, as I have already said to my friend from Connecticut, it subsequently appeared that a Republican Congress and a Republican administration thought that trust funds should be counted as an available balance; hence the law of 1890. That being the case, I say, it is utterly unfair—it nearly approximates shamelessness—for gentlemen to accuse the Secretary of the Treasury of “juggling” upon an item of that sort.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GLASS. I do.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is criticizing very severely, in their absence, gentlemen on this side of the House in reference to one item in the Treasury statement. It is true, is it not, that the gentleman's statement of facts is contained in the Treasury statement every day as a footnote, and has been so contained for a long time?

Mr. GLASS. Yes; that is precisely the point I am trying to accentuate.

Mr. MANN. So that these gentlemen were aware of that fact?

Mr. GLASS. If they were, they did not mention it in their criticisms; and that is exactly of what I complain.

Mr. MANN. I do not think the gentleman understood the speeches.

Mr. GLASS. I heard some of them; others I did not hear, nor are they yet printed in the RECORD. I heard the suggestion made that the Secretary of the Treasury ought to be put in jail for conforming the Treasury statement to a law that was passed by a Republican Congress and approved by a Republican President.

Mr. MANN. It was not in reference to that item. Of course, the gentleman ought to know that.

Mr. GLASS. The comment which I heard and to which I refer made no distinction as to items.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman would not intentionally mislead the House, but unintentionally he has misled the House.

Mr. GLASS. Of course the gentleman knows I have no purpose to mislead the House; moreover, I had not noticed the absence of the gentlemen to whom I have referred. I will not continue my remarks if it is thought that I would better wait until those gentlemen are here.

Mr. MANN. I do not make any special question about that, but—

Mr. GLASS. I desire to repeat that I did not observe the absence of the gentlemen. However, I am not saying anything disagreeable about them.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is criticizing them very much more severely than they criticized the Secretary.

Mr. GLASS. As to that, there is a distinct difference of opinion. One of these gentlemen apparently wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury put in jail. Surely I would not wish that in respect of the gentleman from Michigan. [Laughter.] I simply wanted to point out that the judgment passed by him on the present Secretary of the Treasury would have incarcerated every Republican Secretary of the Treasury who held the office under four Republican Presidents within the last 25 years.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is calling attention now to a matter and talking about a matter that is contained in a footnote of the Treasury statement and has been contained for a long time.

Mr. GLASS. That being so, is it fair to bring the accusation against the Secretary of the Treasury of trying to conceal something, trying to "pad the figures" of the Treasury Department? If what has been done is so plainly stated upon this Treasury exhibit that anybody can understand, is that "juggling"? Would you call that "padding"?

Mr. MANN. Certainly not. That is not what the criticism made by gentlemen on this side of the House was directed to. The gentleman ought to know that.

Mr. GLASS. I do not know it. The criticism from that side was directed against items that are clearly explained. I heard the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] make the criticism. His speech has not yet appeared in the RECORD, hence I can not directly quote from it, but I heard him make that criticism.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. GLASS. Oh, yes.

Mr. NORTON. Is it not a fact that what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] said was that if any national banker in the United States employed the same system of bookkeeping as that employed by the Treasury Department, he would by the bank examiner be arrested and prosecuted and sent to jail?

Mr. GLASS. Which means—

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman state whether in his opinion the Treasury Department would permit any national banker to use the same system of bookkeeping as they are using in the Treasury Department to-day?

Mr. GLASS. I will say that at the very least—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like a little time; say, 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. HILL. No; I do not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] says he desires 10 minutes when the gentleman from Virginia has concluded.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman who last addressed an inquiry to me [Mr. NORTON] that the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] was, in the last degree, extravagant. No national bank official would be put in jail for using a system of accounts that was merely contrary to the judgment of a particular expert accountant. Expert accountants differ widely as to how books should be kept. A national bank keeping its accounts contrary to the method prescribed by the Comptroller of the Currency would be directed to alter its system; its officers would not be put in jail. But if the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan had any application at all it meant that the Secretary of the Treasury is responsible for a financial statement so intentionally misleading that only his high official station shields him from criminal prosecution; that if somebody else in a subordinate place had committed a like offense he would have been put in jail.

Mr. NORTON. No; I think the gentleman from Virginia is mistaken in that. The inference that the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan carries to most of the Members of this House is, I believe, that a different system is employed in the Treasury Department than is permitted to be employed in

national banks, and that is the only fair inference that can be drawn from the statement, which is as follows—

Mr. GLASS. Well, that is an interpretation of his language that differs from the conception which I have.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman from Michigan yesterday said, as appears on page 339 of the RECORD:

Your Treasurer has changed the manner of bookkeeping in the United States Treasury; and if there were a national bank within the limits of the United States to-day that would adopt the manner of bookkeeping such as has been adopted by the Treasury of the United States, the bank examiner, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, would have every man connected with that bank in jail within 24 hours.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield to the gentleman for a speech, nor to permit him to project into my remarks a quotation from somebody else's speech.

Mr. NORTON. It is only fair to read the gentleman's exact statement, is it not?

Mr. GLASS. A great many things are fair that are not permissible when a Member has limited time in which to present his views. I do not want to yield all my time to the gentleman.

Mr. NORTON. But, let me ask the question—

Mr. GLASS. The difference between the gentleman and me is very simple. He attaches to the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] a meaning that I do not think they convey.

Mr. NORTON. Is it not a fact that the Treasury Department would not to-day permit any national bank to use the same kind of bookkeeping that the Treasury Department is using?

Mr. GLASS. I do not think the same kind of bookkeeping used in the Treasury Department could be adapted to a national bank.

Mr. NORTON. Oh, that is it; one system for the Treasury Department and another system for national banks.

Mr. GLASS. There is nothing remarkable about that. One successful business house may not use the same system of accounting that another employs.

Mr. NORTON. But the gentleman—

Mr. GLASS. The gentleman does not want to take all my time?

Mr. NORTON. No; I do not; but it seems to me—

Mr. GLASS. Well, the gentleman is taking my time and without my consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia will proceed.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, the whole trend of the criticism of the Treasury Department yesterday betrayed a purpose to severely arraign the Secretary of the Treasury for attempting to "deceive the public"; to "juggle" with the Treasury figures; to "pad" them, and to make it appear that the balance in the Treasury was greater than it really was. If that was not the purpose of the debate, what was it?

It was nothing else; and I want to indicate to the House how utterly unfair were these imputations upon the Secretary of the Treasury. I have already shown that one major change in the Treasury statement involved a return to the old Treasury form in vogue since July, 1890, based on a Federal statute passed by a Republican Congress and approved by a Republican President. All of the items in the Treasury exhibit, including the one just cited, were explained clearly and in detail by the Secretary of the Treasury when the change of statement was first made. In confirmation of this I hold in my hand a Treasury statement, as of date October 1, 1915, the whole front page of which is taken up with a detailed explanation of the alterations made in the old form. Now, I appeal to the fair judgment of the House to say if anything could be more straightforward than that? Can any critic honestly say that it betrays any purpose whatsoever to mislead the public? The whole transaction was aboveboard. Every solitary change made was explicitly pointed out on this front page of the Treasury statement.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, and shall insert in the RECORD, an article from the New York Commercial and Financial Chronicle, obviously written by a man thoroughly familiar with every phase of accounting, who manifestly knows what he is talking about. This writer does not agree in all respects with the financial form of statement now being issued by the Treasury Department. In some ways the article is critical, but the writer has the fairness to declare that—

It is due Secretary McAdoo to state that the nature of the changes by which this new result was reached and the reasons for them were set out at considerable length and with indisputable clearness in an announcement which occupied a whole page in the Treasury statement for October 1, 1915.

This Financial Chronicle justly arraigns those who "affect to believe that Secretary McAdoo's explanation is obscure," and adds, "The truth is what has been done could hardly have been set out with greater clarity."

In the course of yesterday's debate, when gentlemen were recklessly directing their bitter attacks upon the Secretary of the Treasury, was there one among them frank enough to tell all the truth as this public journal tells it? Can you point to a sentence in any speech made by a gentleman on that side from which it may even be inferred that the Secretary of the Treasury, when he altered the form of the financial statement, issued a detailed explanation of the changes made, clearly defining the reason for every alteration, so there was no possibility of deception? Mr. Speaker, this statement which I hold in my hand is literally free from any suspicion of disingenuousness. There is about it no semblance of a desire to "juggle figures," and I assert that the accusation against the Secretary of the Treasury of having "padded the Treasury statement" in order to deceive the public is grossly untrue.

In further evidence of this I shall insert in the RECORD a portion of this article from the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, of New York.

Mr. STEENERSON. Would the gentleman just as soon insert the whole article?

Mr. GLASS. Unquestionably I would.

Mr. STEENERSON. I would like to have you do that.

Mr. GLASS. I will do that; there is no part of it that I desire to conceal. The gentleman heard me say distinctly that the writer criticizes in some respects the form of statement used by the Treasury Department.

Mr. Speaker, the other of the two major items in the Treasury statement which have been made the subject of criticism is the fund placed to the credit of disbursing officers. Should anybody ask a layman's opinion as to the proper place of this account on the ledger, I would be disposed to say that it should be segregated in the accounting as well as in fact. But that would be the opinion of a person who knows nothing of accounting. Totally disagreeing with that view, and strongly upholding the form adopted recently by the Treasury Department, are some of the best expert accountants in the United States.

I have here an article contributed to the Annalist, an auxiliary publication of the New York Times, devoted largely to financial and commercial matters. It is an article prepared by F. L. Gilbert, who is a certified public accountant of the State of New York, and manager of one of the largest business concerns in the country. Mr. Gilbert discusses this matter in detail, and I shall ask permission to insert his article in the RECORD. This certified public accountant of New York takes the view that the Secretary of the Treasury was perfectly right, from an accounting standpoint, in making the alteration indicated in the Treasury statement.

Mr. STEENERSON. What alterations, the \$25,000,000 one?

Mr. GLASS. There is no question, there can be no question, of the fact that the Secretary was right in returning to the old form in respect to that item. It is a statutory form which prevailed for 23 years. He had no legal right to depart from it. Does the gentleman deny that?

Mr. STEENERSON. We will admit that it looked a little suspicious when the Treasury Department cut down the surplus turned over to him by the Republicans, and then when the surplus got low he increased the balance \$85,000,000 over night.

Mr. GLASS. As a matter of fact, it was \$34,000,000.

Mr. STEENERSON. Sixty-two million.

Mr. GLASS. Counting both ways, it was \$68,000,000. I have stated to the House that this alteration was mistakenly made by the Secretary of the Treasury, in the first instance, on the recommendation of a committee of efficiency experts supplied by the Civil Service Commission. Their recommendation was scientifically right, but unlawful.

Mr. STEENERSON. I have not criticized that, but the gentleman must admit that it looks suspicious when the general balance got down to \$40,000,000, that by a change in bookkeeping it was swelled to \$85,000,000 over night.

Mr. GLASS. If the gentleman wants to persist in his suspicion that the Secretary of the Treasury could be capable of intending to deceive the people of the United States—

Mr. STEENERSON. I did not intend that; I said it was a suspicious circumstance that they changed the bookkeeping, swelling the amount to \$85,000,000 over night. Why did they not change it back immediately after they found it was illegal? Why did they wait until the balance got down to \$42,000,000?

Mr. GLASS. What the gentleman means, in the last analysis, is that he persists in his suspicion that the Secretary of the Treasury altered the statement to deceive the public into believing that there was a larger balance in the Treasury than actually existed. I do not believe that the present Secretary of the Treasury is capable of such meanness, nor am I willing to

believe that any Republican Secretary of the Treasury was ever capable of it.

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not claim that, but I say it looked a little that way.

Mr. GLASS. Oh, yes; the gentleman still persists in his suspicion. He is like the fellow who says: "If I have said anything offensive, I apologize for it, but am glad of it." As a matter of fact, what the Secretary did was to return to the old form of statement which he had mistakenly departed from.

Mr. STEENERSON. Why did he depart?

Mr. GLASS. I have told you; on the recommendation of efficiency experts supplied by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. STEENERSON. Why did he depart from it?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. GLASS. I think the Speaker states the case correctly, hence I ask for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, when interrupted by the gentleman from Minnesota and diverted from the point, I was saying that I would insert in the RECORD an article by F. L. Gilbert, contributed to the Analyst, an auxiliary publication of the New York Times, devoted to financial matters, which points out in detail the changes in the Treasury statement, comments on them fairly, and justifies the Secretary of the Treasury in every item but one, from a strictly bookkeeping and accounting point of view. Thus it would seem, upon the testimony of an experienced public accountant of the State of New York, that the Secretary of the Treasury, from an accounting standpoint, was perfectly right in the alterations in the Treasury statement made by him.

Mr. Speaker, whatever may have been the Secretary's purpose—whether it was to force a larger Treasury balance, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] seems to suspect, or whether it was to obey the law—he was indisputably right in returning to that form of Treasury statement which was required by the Federal statutes, a form of Treasury statement, however, which this certified public accountant says is utterly defective, and which the New York Commercial and Financial Chronicle says is utterly defective, although it had been used in the Treasury Department for 23 years under Republican administrations. I hereto append first the article contributed by Mr. F. L. Gilbert to the Analyst, of issue Monday, December 6, 1915, and next the article from the New York Commercial and Financial Chronicle of November 20, 1915. They both afford a thorough vindication of the Secretary of the Treasury from the more or less absurd and, in some cases, malignant aspersions to which he has been subjected. I will also append, under leave to extend, the "Announcement" made by the Secretary of the Treasury on the front page of the Treasury statement of October 1, 1915, explaining in detail the alterations made and giving the reason for each change.

AN "O. K." ON MR. MCADOO'S ACCOUNTS—FROM A CAREFUL ANALYSIS AN EXPERT ACCOUNTANT REACHES THE CONCLUSION THAT THE DAILY STATEMENT GIVES A TRUE PICTURE OF THE TREASURY'S CONDITION.

(Written for the Analyst by F. L. Gilbert, C. P. A., New York manager of Ernst & Ernst.)

The public generally has been very much interested in the new form of daily statement adopted by the Secretary of the United States Treasury, William G. McAdoo, which made its first appearance on October 1, 1915. Many criticisms have been made, some even going so far as to claim the new statement is purposely "padded," in order to make the figures look better than the facts justify warrant.

This article is neither written for the purpose of drawing attention to the increase or decrease in the available cash balance, nor as a commentary on Government cash receipts and disbursements. It is prepared entirely for the purpose of showing from an accountant's viewpoint whether the statement is in accordance with sound accounting and business practice as approved by the best authorities.

The latest statement has, through a process of evolution under the present Treasury administration, been developed gradually from the old form of statement in use until June 30, 1913.

The principal change made then was in the form of the statement at that time. The old statement, before any changes were made in it by the present Secretary, was simply a statement of various kinds of cash on hand and funds on deposit with certain current liabilities deducted at different convenient places in the statement. On July 2, 1913, the statement of the general fund appeared in the form of an ordinary business balance sheet showing both assets and liabilities. From an accounting standpoint we believe this important change was a distinct improvement and is entirely correct. The current liabilities deducted at different places in the old statement, which we believe were hardly noticed at all by the ordinary layman, are in the new statement all grouped together and footed. They stand out plainly and distinctly.

A SEPARATE LIABILITY.

One other important change made in the statement on July 2, 1913, was the including as a liability the national bank notes redemption fund, amounting to \$22,060,756. This, of course, reduced the net balance in the general fund by that amount. The plan of carrying this fund among the liabilities was continued to September 30, 1915, when it amounted

to \$23,096,069.50. This liability was eliminated in the new statement beginning October 1, 1915. This fund represents money deposited for the redemption of circulating national bank notes by national banks, which have discontinued or decreased their circulation. It is entirely separate from the 5 per cent redemption fund. Under the act of July 14, 1890, such deposits must be carried as a part of the public debt and not as a liability of the Treasury Department. It would certainly not be proper to carry the fund as a liability in both places. If strict accounting practice were followed without regard for the law we believe this fund would continue to be carried as a current liability. The law says it must be treated otherwise, and this appears to be the reason for dropping it in the new statement of October 1, 1915. The Secretary in his "announcement" forming the foreword to his latest revised statement frankly states that it was an error on his part to place this fund on the liability side of the general fund commencing with the statement of July 2, 1913.

In answer to any criticism which might be made as to dropping this liability for the purpose of increasing the balance of the general fund, it should be said that a footnote appears on the statement of October 1, 1915, stating that the outstanding national bank notes for which deposits have been made and which must be paid out of the general fund amount to \$23,096,069.50. Anyone who so desires can, therefore, deduct the amount from the net balance in the fund.

On September 1, 1913, a change was made in the asset side of the statement by eliminating the expression "free and available balance in Treasury and banks." By this omission the silver bullion, subsidiary silver coin, fractional currency, and minor coin which were formerly among the assets as "balances in Treasury offices, limited tender or unavailable," were moved up as part of the cash "in Treasury offices." Inasmuch as it is clearly stated just what each item represents, we believe the change is fully justified.

FORM AND SUBSTANCE.

The change which has received the most comment in the revised statement of October 1, 1915, is the elimination from the liability side of the statement "balances to the credit of disbursing officers." On October 1, 1915, these balances aggregated \$61,089,225.97. In the past it has always been the policy to treat these balances as disbursements, whether the money was actually paid out or not. We can not see how these funds in themselves differ largely from other money of the Government until actually paid out. We believe, therefore, the plan of treating them as part of the general fund balance is entirely justified, especially so when a notation appears opposite the net balance in the fund stating the exact amount to the credit of the disbursing officers.

In the new statement no liability for outstanding checks will appear, as the Secretary claims it is not practicable to get this information daily from disbursing officers. We, of course, are not familiar with the obstacles in the way of getting this information, but the figures are, of course, incorrect to the extent of these outstanding checks. Proper accounting practice requires that when checks are drawn they must be treated as a disbursement and deducted from the available cash balance. As an offset, however, to these outstanding checks the Secretary calls attention to cash receipts in transit to the Treasury. He also states that the monthly statement, which was formerly known as the public-debt statement, and which will be issued about the 15th of the month for the previous month, will show these outstanding checks.

On the whole, we fail to see the slightest evidence indicating a desire to deceive the public in the daily statements of the Treasury or to make the balances appear larger than they really are. It is our opinion, from an accounting standpoint, that the latest revised statement is a great improvement over the former statements. In order that the public may fully understand the new statement the Secretary had printed on the first page on its first appearance on October 1, 1915, a full and frank explanation regarding all important changes which have been made.

THE FINANCIAL SITUATION.

[From the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, New York, Nov. 20, 1915.]

Newspaper columns have been filled this week with sensational reports bearing upon the condition of the United States Treasury. As these have emanated from political sources and obviously been circulated for political effect, they would ordinarily be entitled to no notice or consideration. It happens, however, that Government disbursements have been running in excess of receipts and that Government cash has, as a result, been contracting. It is also well known that administration circles are casting about for new forms of taxes with which to raise additional revenues. This makes it important to examine into the charges. As it happens, too, a basis for the allegations exists in certain changes that have been made in the form of the daily and monthly Treasury statements.

The author of the charges is ex-Senator Jonathan Bourne, jr., of Oregon, and he speaks as president of the Republican Publicity Association. The statement put out is quite a lengthy one, and though its purpose is palpably obvious, we reproduce it in another column, since the newspapers have featured it with all sorts of startling headlines, such as "Says McAdoo's United States millions are phantoms," "Assails McAdoo as a money juggler," "Finds Treasury balance padded more than \$100,000,000," etc. The gist of the allegations is that under the present administration repeated changes have been made in the form of the Treasury statements, this part of the assertion being, as we have already indicated, correct. The latest change dates from October 1, and the principal point in it is that it has increased very materially the so-called available cash balance. Changes of that kind are always viewed with suspicion, even when sound or unobjectionable, and it is important, therefore, to inquire into this departure with the view to seeing whether it can be considered justified.

It is an unfortunate feature that in recent years nearly every new head of the Treasury Department has deemed it expedient to revise the debt and Treasury statements. Usually some improvement is effected as a result of the revision, though by no means invariably so, and often the amendments deal with very minor matters. Congress, on its part, has at times given directions as to how particular items should be treated. Altogether the effect, as far as the ordinary layman is concerned, has been distinctly confusing. The peculiar mischief in such charges as those made by ex-Senator Bourne is that most persons do not consider themselves competent to decide questions of bookkeeping and accounting, and yet are inclined to give credence to reports or intimations of irregularities, on the theory that if they were not at least in part true or did not rest on substantial foundations their authors would not dare to give publicity to them.

On the present occasion the Treasury figures and accounts have been entirely recast. Many innovations are introduced. Some of these are distinct improvements. In particular is this true regarding the tabulations dealing with the gold and silver holdings and the trust funds existing in connection therewith, to take care of the gold and silver certificates that are outstanding against large amounts of the holdings. Under the old form of return the "free" gold available for the general use of the Treasury could not be told except after considerable figuring, nor the balance of silver on hand. Now the accounts are so stated as to show the surplus gold and the available silver dollars with exact precision. That is an important point gained. On the other hand, in some other directions information previously furnished is materially curtailed.

The advantages referred to appeal, of course, to all those who are obliged to consult and study the Government figures for their own enlightenment or that of the public. The general reader is concerned mainly about the truth of the assertions that the Treasury balance has been padded as a consequence of the recasting of the accounts. It is true that the net balance in the general fund now stands very much larger than it did under the old arrangement of the figures. An idea of the extent of the change wrought in that particular is found in the fact that the Treasury statement for September 30 under the old form gave the net balance as \$40,898,894, whereas the statement for the next day (October 1) gave the available balance under the new form as \$128,063,545. Plainly, therefore, the effect of the change has been to add a very large sum to this balance.

It is due to Secretary McAdoo to say that the nature of the changes by which this new result was reached and the reasons for them were set out at considerable length and with indisputable clearness in an "announcement" which occupied a whole page in the Treasury statement for October 1. Mr. Bourne affects to believe that this explanation is obscure. The truth is, what has been done could hardly have been set out with greater clarity.

The increase in the available balance is due to two main alterations, both involving large sums, and we imagine opinions will differ as to the propriety of the changes. As to at least one of them, however, Mr. McAdoo has authority of law behind him. The two changes consist (1) in excluding from the liability side of the general fund the item of "disbursing officers' balances" and (2) in excluding also the amount deposited by national banks for the retirement of national bank notes, but not yet paid out for that purpose. This last amounted on September 30 to \$34,340,866, and is the item as to which the Secretary has authority of law for his act. The item is in every sense a current liability, since the money has been deposited with the Government for the express purpose of retiring the notes and under accurate accounting methods it would be set aside in a specific fund to take care of the notes as they came in. The Secretary recognized the character of the item soon after his advent to office and, changing previous practice in that respect, he had the item marshalled among the current liabilities, thereby diminishing the amount of the available current balance. Experience has shown that the notes in process of retirement are very slow in coming in, and while of course this does not change the character of the liability, the fact remains that Congress had long previously directed by statutory enactment that such deposits should be treated not as a current liability, but as part of the public debt.

The Treasury Department really went outside the pale of the law when two years ago it began to enter the item in its true character as a current liability. The Secretary says frankly now that this was an error. The act of July 14, 1890, prescribes that such deposits shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and that the notes thus rendered, subject to retirement by the United States, shall be carried as part of the public debt—that is, that the item shall be exhibited each month on the printed statement of the public debt under the heading "Debt of the United States bearing no interest." As directed by the act of July 14, 1890, the amount to the credit of this fund was mingled with the general cash and carried there continuously until the early part of the present administration, when the form of the Treasury statement was changed. The item has now been restored to the general fund in accordance with the requirement of the law. The change made in that particular, therefore, is good law, though not in consonance with sound accounting practice.

In the case, however, of the item of disbursing officers' balances, which is of much larger magnitude, it aggregating September 30 \$60,409,181, the Secretary makes a departure entirely on his own responsibility. He points out that these disbursing officers' balances consist of amounts placed by the Secretary of the Treasury to the credit of disbursing officers, against which they are authorized to draw checks in payment of public obligations. In the past, whenever the Secretary has placed an amount to the credit of a disbursing officer it has been the custom to carry that on the Treasury statement as a disbursement. The Secretary states that as a matter of fact the money in many instances is not spent for months, and sometimes not at all, being returned to the Secretary's account.

The argument is plausible enough, but nevertheless these balances have all the characteristics of a current liability. They represent disbursements not actually paid out but set aside for payment, and to a larger or smaller extent they are immediately drawn against. To just the extent this is done the balances no longer have any existence. The Secretary says it will be impossible to state outstanding checks in the column of liabilities in the daily statement because it is not practicable to get the information daily from disbursing officers. It is contemplated, however, to set up outstanding warrants, checks, and matured coupons as a liability in the monthly debt statement. Obviously, to the extent at least that warrants, checks, etc., are on any given day outstanding, they ought to appear as a liability. To report the available cash balance without deducting the same is an overstatement in just that amount.

Mr. McAdoo argues that the new daily statement is on a cash basis. Receipts, he states, under the old method were reported on a cash basis, while disbursements were on a mixed basis. This proved confusing. Under the new form, he contends, disbursements, like receipts, will represent cash transactions. But in ordinary business affairs, when a check is drawn in payment of a bill, or of a service rendered, it is counted as a disbursement and cash balance marked down accordingly. The money is no longer considered available, whether the check is presented immediately or not until two or three days later.

The Secretary argues that outstanding checks and warrants are offset in large measure by receipts which are in transit to the Treasury. That may be, but it does not alter the fact that such warrants and checks should be deducted, even if the full amount standing to the credit of disbursing officers is not eliminated. The results are in error by the aggregate amount of such outstanding items. Why it should be so difficult

cult to get the records of checks and warrants is hard to understand, but the Secretary lays emphasis on the point and says that inasmuch as it will be necessary to get information from disbursing officers all over the country, the monthly statement, heretofore issued promptly on the first of the month, will be greatly delayed, though it is believed that this can be so expedited that the department will be able to issue the statement on the 15th of each month. The statement for the present month had not yet reached us up to late last night.

If the daily record of available cash balance is in error in the particular mentioned, there is this much to be said, that a footnote is added to each day's statement showing the amount of moneys held for retirement of national bank circulation, while the item of disbursing officers' balances is also stated. Accordingly, it is possible to calculate the balance on the old basis if so desired.

When all has been said that can be said, it remains true nevertheless that these repeated changes by one administration after another in the form and character of the debt and Treasury statements are disturbing and highly objectionable, if for no other reason that they render difficult comparisons with the past on an identical basis. The lesson which the experience teaches would seem to be that the character and contents of these statements ought to be prescribed by law so as to render it impossible for each new head of the Treasury Department to impose on the form of the statement his own ideas as to what it should be.

DAILY STATEMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TREASURY.
(Oct. 1, 1915.)
ANNOUNCEMENT.

The daily statement of the United States Treasury and the monthly public-debt statement of the Government have been revised by a committee appointed by order of Secretary McAdoo so as to make them more intelligible and clear to the public. The new daily statement will represent the actual condition of the Treasury, so far as it is possible to present it, at the close of business each day. The new public-debt statement will show the actual condition of the Treasury and the state of the public debt at the close of business each month. The new form for the daily Treasury statement becomes effective October 1, 1915, and that for the public-debt statement October 31, 1915.

The most important points in which the new form of daily statement differs from the old are the following:

The assets and liabilities of the Government have heretofore been published under two general classifications, viz: (1) The general fund, and (2) the currency trust funds, the general fund, and the gold reserve fund.

The new form shows the assets and liabilities divided into three classes, viz: (1) Gold, (2) silver dollars, and (3) the general fund. This gives at a glance the amount of gold and the amount of silver dollars in the Treasury, the liabilities against such coin and bullion, and the actual condition of the general fund.

In the new form the item "Disbursing officers' balances" is excluded from the liability side of the general fund and included in the net balance. These disbursing officers' balances consist of amounts placed by the Secretary of the Treasury to the credit of disbursing officers, against which they are authorized to draw checks in payment of public obligations. These amounts are funds of the United States in the same sense that the balance remaining, subject to the warrant of the Secretary alone, is money of the United States. In the past, whenever the Secretary has placed an amount to the credit of a disbursing officer, it has been the custom to carry that on the Treasury statement as a disbursement. As a matter of fact, the money in many instances is not spent for months, and sometimes not at all, being returned to the Secretary's account. Funds are placed to the credit of disbursing officers practically as a bookkeeping arrangement, and they are as much a part of the working balance of the Treasury as the money which is subject to the warrant of the Secretary. As the net balance should represent the funds in the Treasury available for paying the current obligations of the Government, the amount placed on the books to the credit of disbursing officers should be included therein.

The amount deposited by national banks for the retirement of national bank notes but not yet paid out for that purpose is also included in the net balance. In the old statement this amount was carried on the liability side of the general fund. This was an error, because by law deposits for the retirement of national bank notes are a part of the public debt. The act of July 14, 1890, prescribes that such deposits shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and that the notes thus rendered subject to retirement by the United States shall be carried as a part of the public debt. This fund is not the 5 per cent fund provided for the redemption of the current circulation of national banks, but is a fund for the redemption of the notes of national banks which have ceased to circulate notes, or which have reduced their circulation. As directed by the act of July 14, 1890, the amount to the credit of this fund was placed in the general fund balance, where it was carried continuously until the early part of this administration (1913), when the form of daily Treasury statement was changed. The item is now restored to the general fund balance, where it belongs, and will appear as a liability on what was previously known as the monthly public debt statement.

Following the general fund statement appears the daily trial balance of the general fund, entitled "Receipts and disbursements this day." This is a simple statement of the day's transactions. One important change contained in this table, as well as in the "Comparative analysis of receipts and disbursements," on page 3, is the segregation of Panama Canal receipts.

In the past it has been customary to set forth Panama Canal disbursements separately as extraordinary expenditures, but receipts from tolls, profits from the sales of material on account of the canal, etc., have been included in the ordinary miscellaneous receipts. In future these Panama Canal receipts, like the disbursements on account of the Panama Canal, will appear separately.

The new daily statement is on a cash basis. Receipts have been reported on a cash basis, while disbursements have been on a mixed basis. This has proved confusing. Under the new form disbursements, like receipts, represent cash transactions.

It will be impossible to state outstanding checks in the column of liabilities in the daily statement, because it is not practicable to get the information daily from disbursing officers. Outstanding checks and warrants are offset in large measure, however, by receipts which are in transit to the Treasury. All outstanding warrants and checks will be shown monthly in what previously was known as the public-debt statement.

Several tables that appeared on the fourth page of the old statement are either omitted entirely as unimportant or uninforming, or are in-

cluded in the new items on page 4—"Federal reserve notes and national bank notes outstanding" and "Transactions affecting Federal reserve and national bank-note circulation." "Bonds held in trust for national banks" still appears, but the table of "Pay warrants drawn" has been omitted. It is believed that a daily statement of these warrants is of no value, and it will hereafter appear in the form of "Pay warrants issued," monthly, in what previously was known as the public-debt statement.

The new statement will give an accurate idea of the actual condition of the Treasury as far as it is ascertainable from day to day. The old statement, with its cumbersome notations of purely bookkeeping transactions within the Treasury Department, which had little bearing upon actual expenditures, has been very confusing and has led to much misconception as to the actual condition of the Treasury.

The public-debt statement in the new form is changed to "Financial statement of the United States Government."

Instead of reproducing the daily statement for the last day of each month on the public-debt statement the new statement will include a table of cash available to pay maturing obligations, or, in other words, the working balance of the Treasury, with the liabilities against it. On the asset side of this table will be the net balance in the Treasury. On the liability side of this statement will be set up outstanding warrants, checks, and matured coupons. While it will not be practicable, as stated above, to get daily from disbursing officers a statement of their outstanding checks, it will be possible to get this information once a month.

The monthly statement will also include a table of warrants and checks issued by departments which will show the expenditures according to this classification.

It will be necessary to get information from disbursing officers all over the country for the monthly statement, but it is believed that this can be so expedited that the department will be able to issue the statement on the 15th of each month.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] asked some time ago for unanimous consent for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, for the last year and a half or two years I have tried to keep track of the workings of the United States Treasury and the operations of the tariff law which was passed during that time. It has been my custom every morning to receive this report. I received it on the 1st day of October, I had also received it the day before, on the 30th day of September, and I want to tell you the difference between the two, for I made a memorandum of it at the time. The balance on hand on September 30 was \$40,898,898. The next day it was \$128,063,545.23. I read the explanation of discrepancies referred to by the gentleman from Virginia. It was a plain, straightforward statement on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury, giving an explanation which I fully understood, or thought I did, except in regard to one item, and I think it was my fault that I did not understand that. Let me give you that item. On September 30 the deficiency for the year had aggregated \$43,486,740.93 and the next day it had shrunk to \$29,978,235.56. The whole situation was unfortunate. I do not charge to anybody, the Secretary of the Treasury or anybody else, any intentional wrongdoing in this matter. I simply say that the statement as now issued and as it has been issued since the 1st of October is misleading—though I think unintentionally—to the American people, and that it ought not to have been done in the middle of an administration that has continued the old form of statement for nearly two years.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] fairly and squarely, as he always has acted for the last 20 years that I have known him in this House, states that in his judgment the present statement ought not to be as it is. I do not care what the law is; I care nothing about that. To tell me, even if the law was passed by a Republican administration, that the \$26,000,000 of money to-day held in trust paid in by the banks of the United States for a specific purpose should be reported to the American people as available funds for the use of the Treasury is wrong. That the Treasury has a legal right to use it and carry the unpaid bank notes as a debt, I do not dispute. I do deny the morality of the transaction.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt my friend? Who is responsible for the wrong?

Mr. HILL. I do not care who is responsible.

Mr. GLASS. That is the very question that is under consideration.

Mr. HILL. I am not making any criticism of the Secretary of the Treasury. I am making a criticism upon this statement. If it is wrong to-day it was wrong during the first 18 months of your administration, when it was reported differently, and it is unfair and unjust to the prior administration, for the balance reported on hand June 30, 1913, would have been very much larger than \$165,960,984 if the method of reporting in use now had been employed then.

Mr. GLASS. I think it was wrong for 23 years.

Mr. HILL. And so do I. What is the result? I would not asperse anybody, and yet I could not help thinking of a story when I read this last October. There is an old story about building the Fourth Avenue Tunnel in New York, built by the Harlem Railroad, under the auspices of Commodore Vanderbilt.

A gentleman one day asked him on what terms he built this railroad, what the agreements with the city of New York were, and he said, "We built it with the understanding that the city of New York should pay half and the Harlem Railroad should pay half," and I will not use his exact language, but he said in reply, further, "I am extremely glad that the city of New York paid the half she did, for if she had paid the other half she would not have paid nearly as much." [Laughter.] I thought of that when I read this statement of October 1, and I have thought of it ever since. I say to you as a bank officer that such a statement as that made from day to day, whether in accordance with the law or in violation of the law, is wrong.

Let me give you the statement of December 15, received by me this morning and submit it to your individual judgment as to whether it is wrong or right. Net balance, \$106,148,796.28. The average citizen of the United States would think that was the money the Treasury had on hand available for use. It is not. It is not within \$105,000,000 of it. That is not right, whether the law justifies it or not. What would you deduct? The Secretary puts against it a side note that \$52,814,000 of it is to the credit of the disbursing officers. That accounts for that much. Down in little fine print at the bottom is a footnote that \$26,175,358 of it has been sent in by national banks to pay outstanding bank notes, and in the general column is subsidiary coin, nonlegal tender, fractional currency, nonlegal tender, minor coin, nonlegal tender, except in small amounts, silver bullion available for coinage, but nonlegal tender in its present form. But taking out of that \$106,000,000, money that is already set aside for other purposes, and which can not be used except for those purposes—taking out of that \$106,000,000 the trust funds paid in by the banks for a specific purpose, taking out of it the nonlegal tender money which would not naturally be used, there is still left in the Treasury this morning, instead of \$106,000,000—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, for five minutes more. I will not use it all.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. There is plenty of time.

Mr. HILL. Instead of \$106,000,000, taking out these items, which any man who ever kept a corner grocery store in the United States knows should not be included, there is but \$1,148,267 which should represent in that statement the available funds in the Treasury.

Mr. GLASS. Will my friend let me interrupt him right there?

Mr. HILL. And I will join with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] if he will bring in a bill to compel by law a change in this form of statement, in order that the American people can tell where their money is and how much of it the Treasury has on hand with no prior claims against it.

Mr. GLASS. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HILL. I will.

Mr. GLASS. The gentleman from Connecticut will admit that a trust fund of \$32,000,000 was required by law to be stated precisely, as the Secretary of the Treasury in this changed form does state it?

Mr. HILL. I do not question it at all.

Mr. GLASS. Very well. Then as to the fund to the credit of disbursing officers, amounting, I believe, to approximately \$62,000,000.

Mr. HILL. It was \$52,000,000 this morning.

Mr. GLASS. It was \$62,000,000 when it was transferred on October 1.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. GLASS. As to that fund, will my friend read him what a certified accountant—

Mr. HILL. I have not the time for that. I think I have read it.

Mr. GLASS. So that so far from its being a system that would discredit a corner grocery—

Mr. HILL. You and I are to blame for it.

Mr. GLASS. Hold on. So far as its being a system that would discredit a corner grocery clerk, here is a certified public accountant of the State of New York, and here is one of the most reputable financial journals printed in the United States, both saying from a strict accounting standpoint it is all right.

Mr. HILL. I do not recognize, Mr. Speaker, the validity of an opinion of a paid employee or space writer operating against my conscience and judgment, and neither does the gentleman from Virginia. That statement of the Treasury is not a true

statement of conditions now, or it was not for the first 18 months of this administration.

Mr. GLASS. This gentleman is not a paid employee of the United States Government. He is general manager of the firm of Ernst & Ernst, of New York City. The editor of the New York Financial Chronical is not a paid employee of the United States Government.

Mr. HILL. I do not wish to refer the question to anybody. I have referred it to the judgment of the gentleman himself, and he did not say that the statement was right.

Mr. GLASS. I do not think so. But certified public accountants do think so. My purpose in rising was to discuss this statement that the Secretary of the Treasury had juggled figures and padded his statement in trying to deceive the public.

Mr. HILL. I did not say that the Secretary did it in that way or for that purpose.

Mr. GLASS. On the contrary, my friend from Connecticut expressly disclaims any such imputation.

Mr. HILL. I do. If he intended any such thing he would not have published that explanation on October 1; but these statements published in the daily papers of the country, as a rule, do not contain the explanations and footnotes, nor do the permanent statistical records of the Government contain them, or, at least, I have never found them there. The United States Government is required by statute to assume as a debt the amount of unredeemed bank notes, but that does not justify them in carrying the money with which they are to be paid on presentation as available funds for other purposes. And I think there is a general misunderstanding of the present Treasury situation by the people of the country. I would not criticize the Secretary of the Treasury because he made the explanation. But I do hope, with this administration in power, the sudden return to virtue which they had after they had been in power 18 months may be continued now and that this statement may be corrected and it may be understood for the benefit of the American people that the deficiency is greater than it is, that the available funds on hand were about \$1,100,000 instead of \$106,000,000 day before yesterday, and that as we go into the enormous expenditure which in all probability seems inevitable in the future, the average voter in the country may know where the Treasury stands and be given a straightforward statement as to its condition. [Applause.]

Mr. GLASS. May I say that I agree with my colleague, that the statute passed 25 years ago ought to be repealed, but as long as it is a statute the Secretary of the Treasury ought to obey it and never should have departed from it.

Mr. HILL. Let me ask the gentleman a fair question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. HILL. Why did they discover it only after they had been in power for 18 months, and why would it not be fair to carry the new method back to the available funds on hand on March 4, 1913?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

POSTAL SAVINGS BANKS.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider in the House as in Committee of the Whole the bill (H. R. 562) to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, authorizing a Postal Savings System.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] asks unanimous consent to consider in the House as in Committee of the Whole the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 562) to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, authorizing a Postal Savings System.

Be it enacted, etc., That such part of section 6 of the act approved June 25, 1910, authorizing a system of postal savings depositories, as reads "but no one shall be permitted to deposit more than \$100 in any one calendar month" is hereby amended to read as follows: "but the balance to the credit of any person, upon which interest is payable, shall not exceed \$1,000, exclusive of accumulated interest"; and said act is further amended so as to repeal the proviso in section 7 thereof and insert in lieu of such proviso the following: "Provided, That the board of trustees may, in their discretion, and under such regulations as such board may promulgate, accept additional deposits not to exceed in the aggregate \$1,000 for each depositor, but upon which no interest shall be paid."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, let the gentleman from Tennessee make a statement.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, authorizing a Postal Savings System. Under the terms of that act only \$100 could be deposited in any one calendar month in a postal savings bank. Five hundred dollars was the limit that could be deposited by any one person.

This act proposes to change the act, of which it is amendatory, so as to allow the sum of \$1,000 to be deposited and bear interest, and then another thousand dollars to be deposited by the same person, not bearing interest, in the discretion of the trustees of the board.

That is the simple scope of the amendment under this act. This bill, with another provision that is not now in it, was passed unanimously, nearly, in this House and went to the President after passing the Senate, and was vetoed by the President because it contained a provision that permitted the deposit of these postal funds in trust companies or State banks. The President took the position in his veto that this being a Federal system and the Government of the United States being responsible for these deposits, State banking institutions ought not to have the benefit of the provisions, but that the money should be deposited in national banks only.

This bill now eliminates the objection made by the President. He commended the act very much, outside of that objection, and it is offered now in the interest of the depositors provided for under this postal savings bank.

The report in this case shows, and the facts are, that there are thousands of dollars offered at the various places in the United States for deposit in the postal savings banks that can not now be accepted on account of the limit fixed in the law. The sole purpose, as I stated, is to increase that limit. I will read just a section from my report:

Postmasters from all sections of the country are constantly complaining that they are compelled to reject many tenders of amounts in excess of what may now be accepted. It is known that millions of dollars have been lost to circulation and to commercial activities which would have been deposited in our postal savings banks had the restrictions not existed. It is believed that the proposed bill will meet the demands of the public in a very large percentage of instances.

The Postal Savings System now has approximately \$73,000,000 on deposit, standing to the credit of 560,000 depositors. More than 30,000 accounts have now reached the \$500 limit, and the owners of them can deposit no more, despite their appeals to do so. And of these \$500 accounts 22,000 are owned by the foreign born. The Post Office Department assures the committee that the work incident to much larger deposits can be cared for with practically no additional expense.

I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON.]

The SPEAKER. First, is there objection to the consideration of this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] is recognized.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I told the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads that I would not object to the immediate consideration of this bill, but at the same time I think it is my duty to inform the House as to some objections to it which occur to my mind. The postal savings act in section 4 provides—

That accounts may be opened and deposits made in any postal savings depository established under this act by any person of the age of 10 years or over, in his or her own name, and by a married woman in her own name free from any control or interference by her husband; but no person shall at the same time have more than one postal savings account in his or her own right.

Now, this bill strikes from section 6 the limitation as to the amount to be deposited in any one month. Section 6 limits the deposit of any one person to \$100 in any one calendar month, and then it strikes out from section 7 the limitation that any one person shall not have to exceed \$500 and substitutes the figure \$1,000, upon which interest shall be paid, and allows another \$1,000, without interest, in the discretion of the board of managers.

Mr. HILL. May I ask the gentleman a question? Does that allow the \$1,000 to be deposited at once—at one time?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say that if Members wish to interrupt each other they must first address the Chair.

Mr. HILL. I apologize to the Chair.

Mr. STEENERSON. The suggestion has been made that possibly this might work injuriously. It is true that the officials of the department having in charge the Postal Savings System stated that deposits by minors are very small; very few of them exceed \$100. And probably there would be but very few in the future, even if this limit is removed, that would exceed \$100. Certainly there would be but very few that would exceed \$500. But under the proposed bill a minor could put in \$2,000, and you might suppose a case where the head of a family had five or six children over 10 years of age, but minors, and his wife and each one of the children could put in \$2,000, and the money could not be reached by creditors. The Government can not be garnished, and it might be a means of preventing the collection of honest debts. The amount seems to be so large that there would be no real reason for it. Now, these people who are mentioned in the

report of the committee and by the department, who would avail themselves of this enlarged limit of deposit, are principally foreign-born laborers. A very large percentage of them, perhaps two-thirds or three-fourths, are laborers earning wages, who do not like to trust the banks, but are willing to trust the Government, and it is believed that they would deposit the money in these large sums in the postal savings bank. But that would not justify us in enlarging the limit, it seems to me, as to minors. That objection has been raised, and I am submitting it to the House for what it is worth. I am not satisfied that this bill should be passed without any comment, and for that reason, although I am perfectly willing to have it considered, I thought the House had better understand what the effect of it would be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CRISP. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota have five minutes additional.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Minnesota be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Before the passage of the Federal reserve act, I understood that these postal-savings funds could be deposited in State banks.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Since that act was passed the commission handling these funds do not allow postal savings to be deposited in State banks. Now, in some sections of the country there are not any national banks. Take my own home town, for instance, of about 12,000 people. There are four State banks, but there is no national bank. I wanted to ask if the committee had considered the advisability of amending the law and permitting the funds to be deposited in State banks?

Mr. STEENERSON. I would say that the committee recommended this bill in my absence. I got into the meeting too late; but I would like to say that there is this additional objection to the bill that has been suggested by the gentleman from Georgia, that it will enormously increase the amounts deposited in postal savings banks, which will all go to the national banks. They say there are \$73,000,000 in the postal savings banks to-day, when the individual limit is \$500. Now, if you increase the limit to \$2,000, the amount on deposit might reach \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000, or even more, and in that way you would turn the current of deposits away from State banks, as suggested by the gentleman from Georgia, into the national banks, a thing which in some sections would be an injustice.

The bill we passed in the last Congress, H. R. 9967, which was vetoed by President Wilson, required the funds to be deposited in either National or State banks, and the reason for the veto was that this was in conflict with the Federal reserve act, which required Government funds to be deposited only in banks which were members of the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] was referring to the conditions of the Federal reserve act, which requires postal savings to be deposited in banks which are members of the Federal Reserve Association. Is not that practical?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, this bill does not contemplate any interference with the Federal reserve act. It is only a bill to amend and remove the limit in the postal savings-bank law. Now, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] has suggested that in his section of the country and other sections of the country there are no national banks, and that the deposits ought to go to State banks. The provision of the bill which was vetoed by the President covered that very proposition. That was the very ground upon which the President vetoed the former bill. The reason for the veto was very apparent, that State banks and trust companies are not under the control and jurisdiction of the Government of the United States. The Government guarantees this fund. It did not propose, therefore, to guarantee funds in institutions over which it has no control. Therefore the judgment of the Treasury was that the funds should be deposited only in institutions over which the Government has control through the reserve association.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. I ask that my time be extended five minutes more, to allow me to answer these questions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request that the time of the gentleman from Minnesota be extended five minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STEENERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BORLAND. I had not quite concluded. I wanted to call attention to the fact that the distinction was not between national banks and State banks, but between banks that were members of the Federal Reserve Association and those that were not members of the Federal Reserve Association. And inasmuch as State banks and trust companies have the right to become members of the Federal Reserve Association, thereby subjecting themselves to Federal supervision, they can in that way secure the deposits of the postal savings banks.

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, it is possible.

Mr. BORLAND. So it is not a discrimination against State banks as such.

Mr. STEENERSON. I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

Mr. CRISP. I want to inquire if the committee had considered that feature, and while technically the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is correct, the gentleman from Minnesota got the purport of my inquiry, which was, if the State bank is not a member of an association it was debarred from receiving the postal deposits.

Mr. STEENERSON. My information was that the committee understood that all postal savings would go into a national bank or banks that are members of the Federal system, because that is the law, and the reason the former bill was vetoed was that it conflicted with that law. If this bill passes, it would increase by 400 per cent the amount that will be required by law to go into the national or reserve-system banks instead of State banks.

Mr. PLATT. I want to say that the gentleman from Missouri seems to imply, and I think he so stated, that the Federal reserve act requires the postal savings to be placed in a national bank. It does not.

Mr. BORLAND. I did not say that it was so. I said banks that were members of the Federal Reserve Association.

Mr. PLATT. But the Federal reserve act does not require anything of the kind.

Mr. STEENERSON. Was not that the ground of the veto?

Mr. PLATT. Not because the Federal reserve act required it. It was because the Government guaranteed the deposits, and the President thought that they should be in a national bank. I did not entirely agree with him.

Mr. STEENERSON. I will now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD].

Mr. HOWARD. I wanted to get into the RECORD this question, whether or not it was the gentleman's information that all the money accumulated in these postal savings banks can only be deposited in a national bank, whether that bank be a member of the Federal Reserve System or not. That is, suppose a State bank comes in, and it belongs to the Federal Reserve System, does the act include the deposit of funds in that bank?

Mr. STEENERSON. The Federal reserve act requires that Government funds shall be deposited in system banks. The trustees of the postal savings bank system have issued a regulation which requires all sums to be deposited in national or member banks.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. If I am correct in the statement, there is a limit of \$100 that can be deposited in one calendar month, and that was to avoid mischief in the withdrawal of money from local banks and bankrupting the bank. Now, it is my opinion that if you increase the amount to be withdrawn to \$1,000 in a town where there is a State bank and a national bank great mischief and harm might be done to the State bank through conniving officers or persons.

Mr. STEENERSON. Allow me to correct the gentleman. The postal law does not put a limit on the amount of withdrawal; it puts a limit on the amount that can be deposited in any one calendar month.

Mr. FORDNEY. It limits the amount that can be deposited in any one month. The individual is not going to withdraw his money unless he can put it somewhere where he can get more interest, except in extreme cases.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House an appointment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Speaker appoints Representative CHARLES C. CARLIN, of Virginia, to membership on the board of directors of Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum, to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of former Representative Samuel W. Smith, of Michigan.

ADJOURNMENT FOR THE HOLIDAYS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 7.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn December 17, 1915, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Tuesday, January 4, 1916.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

POSTAL SAVINGS BANKS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will pardon me, in the matter under consideration a motion to postpone to a day certain is in order, and I suggest to the gentleman that he move to postpone this matter until the 4th or 5th day of January, so that it will come up then for disposition.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a desire on the part of a number of gentlemen not to dispose of this bill to-day. I therefore ask unanimous consent that its further consideration be postponed until Thursday, January 6, 1916.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the bill under consideration respecting postal savings banks be postponed until Thursday, January 6, 1916. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from North Carolina if it is the intention of the Senate to wait until the resolution which we have just passed gets to that body?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; until the President has signed the joint resolution.

Mr. MANN. And of course the gentleman does not want to finally adjourn the House until they have acted?

Mr. KITCHIN. That is true.

Mr. MANN. Can we have an understanding that there will be no further business transacted to-day of any kind?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; no further business of any kind will be transacted.

Mr. MANN. A number of gentlemen would like to get away. I would like to get away myself.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. We will just sit here.

The SPEAKER. Do we have to wait here until the President has signed the joint resolution?

Mr. MANN. I do not know, but I understand a resolution is coming over from the Senate to which they desire to get the signature of the Speaker, or an enrolled bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. Several gentlemen have suggested that in an adjournment of this nature the Congress would have to remain in session until the President had signed the joint resolution.

Mr. MANN. I am frank to say that I would not want to express an opinion upon that.

The SPEAKER. Then the Chair understands that there is an agreement that there is to be nothing else done except possibly the signing of enrolled bills or resolutions, or things of that sort?

Mr. KITCHIN. That is true.

The SPEAKER. Then the House can practically stand in recess.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carr, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

House concurrent resolution 7.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn December 17, 1915, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock m. on Tuesday, January 4, 1916.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) extending the time for filing the report of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Fiscal Relations between the District of Columbia and the United States.

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution extending the provisions of the act entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," approved October 22, 1914, to December 31, 1916.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution extending the provisions of the act entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," approved October 22, 1914, to December 31, 1916.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution extending the time for filing the report of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Fiscal Relations between the District of Columbia and the United States.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution has been presented to the President. That is all that is required. I therefore move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.), under the concurrent resolution heretofore adopted, the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 4, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for continuing the construction of the Alaskan Railroad (H. Doc. No. 424); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the secretary of the Commission on Industrial Relations, transmitting final report of the Commission on Industrial Relations (H. Doc. No. 425); to the Committee on Labor and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting letter from the Chief of Engineers, together with copy of report on preliminary examination of Fletcher Bay, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 426); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of reexamination of project for operation and care of the lock and dam at Grand Rapids, Wabash River, Ind. and Ill. (H. Doc. No. 427); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Pentwater Harbor, Mich., from the mouth of the channel to Pentwater Lake (H. Doc. No. 429); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of Little Pigeon River, Tenn. (H. Doc. No. 428); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for plans for fortifications for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 430); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting draft of a proposed amendment to the estimates of appropriations for the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 431); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting supplementary estimates of appropriations for buildings and grounds, Military Academy, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 432); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of a letter from Messrs. Daly, Hoyt & Mason, counselors at law, New York, inclosing a report of the operations of the Maritime Canal Co., of Nicaragua (H. Doc. No. 433); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Crescent City Harbor and vicinity, Cal., with a view to securing a suitable harbor (H. Doc. No. 434); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Mosquito Creek, Va. (H. Doc. No. 435); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of mouth of Black River, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 436); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, a report on preliminary examination of Isle Au Haut Harbor, Me. (H. Doc. No. 437); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Ogeechee River, Ga., with a view to its improvement in connection with the inland waterway from Savannah, Ga., to Fernandina, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 438); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

16. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of Lake Traverse, Minn. and S. Dak. (H. Doc. No. 439); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

17. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Farmington River, Conn., with a view to the removal of the bar at its mouth (H. Doc. No. 440); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

18. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Edison Slough, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 441); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on War Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3654) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to audit and adjust certain claims of the State of North Carolina, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 6095) to create a legislative drafting and reference bureau; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GARLAND: A bill (H. R. 6414) providing that an imprint shall be placed on all articles manufactured in the United States and becoming the subject of interstate commerce, and providing that no manufactured articles or goods shall be admitted to the United States unless bearing an imprint; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6415) to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10, and creating a new supervising district; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6416) for the purpose of amending section 5 of the act approved February 11, 1915 (38 Stat. L., p. 807); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6417) to provide for the selection by the Omaha Indians and the setting apart of reservation lands for tribal cemetery purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6418) to authorize the Ponca Tribe of Indians to appear and be made parties to any suits filed in the Court of Claims by the Omaha Tribe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 6419) to provide for the erection of a monument to perpetuate the memory of William R. Smith, late superintendent of the United States Botanic Garden; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 6420) to prohibit the killing and interstate shipment of beef cattle under a certain age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 6421) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and residence of aliens in the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 6422) creating an Army reserve; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 6423) to authorize the Secretary of War to maintain and operate the Government

dredge boats *Gulfport* and *Pascagoula* in cooperating with the various communities along the Mississippi coast in constructing sea walls, and appropriating the sum of \$200,000 therefor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 6424) to extend the benefits of the act of June 27, 1890 (as amended by the act of May 9, 1900), granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who served in the military or naval forces of the United States, their widows, minor children, or dependent parents, and the act of February 6, 1907, granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6425) to provide Federal aid for the improvement of public highways in the United States traveled by rural free-delivery mail carriers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6426) to place the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers under the administration of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6427) to provide for the monthly payment of pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6428) providing for military highways between Forts Leavenworth and Riley, Kans., and between Fort McPherson and the Government rifle range near Waco, in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 6429) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6430) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Court of Private Land Claims and to provide for the settlement of private land claims in certain States and Territories," approved March 3, 1891, and the acts amendatory thereto, approved February 21, 1893, June 27, 1898, and February 26, 1909; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6431) to establish a fish-cultural station in New Mexico; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6432) to provide for an investigation to ascertain the feasibility of the construction of a dam and irrigation ditches in the Estancia Valley, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6433) making an appropriation for the destruction of predatory wild animals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 6434) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Narragansett Pier, R. I.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 6435) to regulate the construction and operation of elevators in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6436) to amend section 51, chapter 4, of the Thirty-sixth Statutes at Large, relating to venue in civil suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6437) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 6438) requiring receivers for national banks to file accounts in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 6439) to increase the pensions of the blind who served in the War with Mexico, the Civil War, and the War with Spain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6440) to authorize and direct the payment of pensions monthly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 6441) to provide for the exchange of the present Federal building site in Newark, Del.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6442) to provide for the exchange of the present Federal building site in Newark, Del.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 6443) for reduction of postage on first-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 6444) providing for the payment of certain items of interest on the judgment of the Court of Claims of May 18, 1905, in favor of the Cherokees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6445) providing an appropriation of \$500,000 for a new quarantine station near Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 6446) for reduction of postage on first-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LAFFAN: A bill (H. R. 6447) granting pensions to soldiers confined in so-called Confederate prisons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6448) to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6449) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COLEMAN: A bill (H. R. 6450) to amend section 260 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 6451) giving the right to make homestead entry to persons who have made and perfected homestead entries; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 6452) to create a Tariff Commission and defining its duties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6453) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6454) to repeal House concurrent resolution 9; section 2 of an act entitled "An act granting to the Sociedad Anonima, denominated 'Pototan Electric Light & Power Co. (Ltd.)', a franchise to install, operate, and maintain an electric light, heat, and power system in the municipality of Pototan, Province of Iloilo, P. I."; and a part of section 3 of an act entitled "An act granting a franchise to Charles M. Swift to construct, maintain, and operate a hydroelectric plant and electric lighting, heating, and power system and electric transmission lines in the Island of Luzon," passed by the Third Philippine Legislature at the second and special sessions of 1914; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES (by request): A bill (H. R. 6455) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 6456) relating to appeals and writs of error and costs thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 6457) to provide an annual vacation for railway mail clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORRISON (by request): A bill (H. R. 6458) providing for the registration of designs; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6459) to provide for the construction of a public building at Duluth, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PARK: A bill (H. R. 6460) to provide for a survey and estimate of cost of a canal connecting the waters of the Flint and Ocmulgee Rivers in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 6461) for the reduction of postage on first-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 6462) providing for the erection and completion of a public building at the city of Stuttgart, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6463) to provide for the purchase of a site and erection thereon of a public building at Two Harbors, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PARK: A bill (H. R. 6464) providing for the establishment of a Weather Bureau station at Albany, Ga.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6465) to acquire a site and construct a public building thereon at International Falls, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6466) to appropriate money to the State of Minnesota and to direct the Secretary of the Interior to pay to the State of Minnesota the amount of money received from the

sale of timber upon lands belonging to the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6467) for relief of settlers on State swamp lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 6468) to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 6469) restoring the jurisdiction to the Court of Claims in certain claims in certain cases; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 6470) to acquire a site for a public building at Norwich, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 6471) to amend an act entitled "An act to protect the birds and animals in Yellowstone National Park, and to punish crimes in said park, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1894; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6775) to amend an act entitled "An act extending the benefits of the marine hospitals to the keepers and crews of life-saving stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6776) to retire enlisted men, either in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, after 25 years' service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6777) to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California to determine in equity the rights of American citizens under the award of the Bering Sea arbitration of Paris and to render judgment thereon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6778) for the relief of former occupants of the present military reservation at Point San Jose, in the city of San Francisco, and to repeal an act entitled "An act to refer the claim of Jessie Benton Fremont to certain lands and improvements thereon in San Francisco, Cal., to the Court of Claims," approved February 10, 1893; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6779) for the establishment and construction of a coal depot, including underwater storage plant, for the use of the United States Navy, on the Bay of San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6780) to authorize the entry and patenting of lands containing asbestos under the placer-mining laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6781) to prohibit the importation into the United States of any goods, wares, or merchandise the property of Americans and other foreigners in Mexico which have been confiscated by Mexican authorities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: Resolution (H. Res. 68) requesting the President to transmit to the House a copy of Prof. Ford's report; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 69) to equalize the salaries of two men styled "cloakroom men" in the Door-keeper's department of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Resolution (H. Res. 70) providing for open meetings of the House and of committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 71) providing for a roll call in the Committee of the Whole upon demand of one-fifth of the Members present; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: Resolution (H. Res. 72) to appoint a committee to investigate the government and conditions in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LEWIS: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 5) to print full report of Commission on Industrial Relations; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CROSSER: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 6) providing for the printing of 150,000 copies of the final report to Congress of the Commission on Industrial Relations; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 72) to amend the Constitution of the United States so that the President and Vice President of the United States shall be elected by direct vote of the electors of the several States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. KINKAID: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 73) providing for a reappraisal of the lands of the former Fort Niobrara Military Reservation, Nebr.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SABATH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 74) to secure the neutralization of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 6472) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Paxson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 6473) granting a pension to Herbert Montgomery; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6474) granting an increase of pension to Pauline Kline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6475) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Deffinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6476) granting an increase of pension to Maria Goetz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6477) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Lohman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6478) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Cooke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6479) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. McKenzie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6480) granting an increase of pension to Emma F. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6481) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Tvehus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6482) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Frank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 6483) granting a pension to Francis M. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6484) granting a pension to Helen M. Ball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6485) granting a pension to Clara Bolin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6486) granting a pension to Katherine Rodgers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6487) granting a pension to Ralph McMahon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6488) granting an increase of pension to Wilson S. Fouts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6489) granting an increase of pension to Melchior Weiler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6490) granting an increase of pension to Margaret R. Smallwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6491) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Oldham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6492) granting a pension to Amanda Pocock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6493) granting a pension to Elizabeth Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6494) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. McCrory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6495) granting an increase of pension to Silemus A. Simons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6496) for the relief of the legal representatives of Col. John Sloane, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 6497) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Dano; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE: A bill (H. R. 6498) granting a pension to Hanna Pietenpol; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 6499) for the relief of the heirs of Elijah Glass; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 6500) granting an increase of pension to John W. Bosler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 6501) granting an increase of pension to Lloyd D. Pocock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6502) granting an increase of pension to Woodward A. Vrooman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6503) for the relief of Michael Philbin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6504) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain lands to be used as a sanitarium by the Fraternal Order of Eagles; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6505) granting a pension to Henry C. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6506) granting an increase of pension to Ruth Van Meter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6507) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Randolph; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6508) granting a pension to Anna Carver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 6509) granting a pension to Clara May Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6510) granting an increase of pension to Julian Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6511) granting an increase of pension to Susan Forney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6512) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hummelbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6513) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6514) granting an increase of pension to Lavinia West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6515) granting an increase of pension to Jane Hoover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6516) granting an increase of pension to Katharine D. Treibler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6517) granting an increase of pension to Samuel I. McPherron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6518) for the relief of Charles Akerlund; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 6519) granting a pension to Peter B. Daughters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6520) granting a pension to Eliza Sisco; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6521) granting a pension to Roy A. Day; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6522) granting an increase of pension to Louis Ernest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6523) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Edington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6524) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Hogland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6525) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Trigg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6526) granting an increase of pension to Manlabert C. Rawlison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6527) granting an increase of pension to John Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6528) granting an increase of pension to David Reeder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6529) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Grebe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6530) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Dawson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6531) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Hoagland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6532) granting an increase of pension to Samantha McCracken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6533) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Dobbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6534) granting an increase of pension to Charles Apel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6535) granting an increase of pension to John W. Amos; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6536) granting an increase of pension to John A. C. Hazel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6537) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Crabb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6538) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6539) granting an increase of pension to Norval G. Sparks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6540) granting a pension to Joseph F. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6541) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6542) granting an increase of pension to John Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6543) granting an increase of pension to William H. Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6544) granting an increase of pension to Lewis W. Sims; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6545) granting an increase of pension to James Bechwith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6546) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Wayman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6547) granting an increase of pension to Elisha D. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6548) granting a pension to Mary Jane Patrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 6549) granting a pension to Charles A. Backus; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6550) granting a pension to Helen Fenzle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6551) granting a pension to Henry F. Caplick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6552) granting a pension to Frank Gravius; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6553) granting a pension to George W. Neely; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6554) granting a pension to Michael Eller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6555) granting a pension to Bertha M. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6556) granting a pension to Frederick Rattke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6557) granting a pension to Guy L. Joslin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6558) granting a pension to Carolina Reichold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6559) granting a pension to William A. Widrig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6560) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6561) granting an increase of pension to Martin Bury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6562) granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Perry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6563) for the relief of C. E. Lockwood; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6564) for the relief of Carrie Stevens Todd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DRUKKER: A bill (H. R. 6565) for the relief of the Paterson & Ramapo Railroad Co., of Paterson, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DUPRE: A bill (H. R. 6566) granting an increase of pension to Louise M. Swift; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6567) for the relief of the Teutonia Loan & Building Co., of New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6568) for the relief of the Sixth District Building & Loan Association, of New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6569) for the relief of the Fidelity Homestead Association, of New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6570) for the relief of the Union Homestead Association, of New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 6571) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Houlihan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 6572) granting an increase of pension to John Rebstock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 6573) granting a pension to Harriet E. Hallenbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6574) granting an increase of pension to William Ingraham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6575) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Norman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 6576) for the relief of John Reinhart; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6577) for the relief of Andrew Dougherty and Edward J. Dougherty, executors of the estate of Andrew Dougherty, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6578) to remove the charge of desertion against Charles A. Lester; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 6579) granting a pension to Amy Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6580) granting a pension to Clara L. Vawn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6581) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Quest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6582) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Schrawder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6583) granting an increase of pension to Elliott E. Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6584) granting an increase of pension to David E. Shaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6585) granting an increase of pension to John C. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 6586) for the relief of the Cincinnati, Saginaw & Mackinaw Railroad Co., of Saginaw, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 6587) granting an increase of pension to David A. Sturtevant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 6588) granting a pension to Orrilla Hough Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6589) granting an increase of pension to Hattie A. Beach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6590) granting an increase of pension to Fannie L. Thorman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 6591) for the relief of the heirs of William P. Burrough; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 6592) granting a pension to Mary Pierce; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6593) granting a pension to Delia White; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6594) to place the name of Jesse B. Kimes on the unlimited retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6595) providing for the refund to the Colonial Realty Co. certain corporation tax paid in excess; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6596) to appoint J. D. Nevin a second lieutenant on the active list of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6597) to pay the several sums of money found due certain navy-yard employees by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 6598) granting an increase of pension to William F. Emerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6599) for the relief of W. R. Wells, administrator of the estate of James S. Wells, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 6600) granting a pension to Remus Swain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 6601) granting a pension to Joshua E. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 6602) granting a pension to Harriet Anna Burns; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6603) granting a pension to Margaret Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 6604) granting an increase of pension to John W. Burks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6605) granting an increase of pension to James Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 6606) granting a pension to John T. McCarthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6607) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. McFarland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6608) granting an increase of pension to Lida M. Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6609) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte F. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6610) granting an increase of pension to Emma Roselle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6611) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 6612) granting a pension to Jonathan Milburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6613) granting a pension to Mary Hillebrandt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6614) granting an increase of pension to John L. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6615) for the relief of heirs of Duncan C. McLeod, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6616) for the relief of the German Savings, Building & Loan Association, of Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6617) granting a pension to Charles O. Saers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6618) granting an increase of pension to William Gilliland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6619) granting an increase of pension to Richard Riddles; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 6620) granting a pension to Hamilton Masse; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6621) granting an increase of pension to Donat Weisenberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIEB: A bill (H. R. 6622) granting an increase of pension to Abashabe Noten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 6623) granting a pension to Henrietta Glessner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6624) granting a pension to Edward T. Conway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6625) granting a pension to Dellvenia Emmert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6626) granting a pension to William Bieber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6627) granting a pension to Margaret Ann Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6628) granting a pension to Melvin P. Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6629) for the relief of the Maryland Trust Co., of Baltimore; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 6630) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6631) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Schoolcraft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOFT: A bill (H. R. 6632) granting a pension to Charles N. Hildreth; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6633) to reimburse Gaetona de Luca & Co. for damages sustained by them by reason of the failure of the United States post office to transmit certain moneys delivered to it for transmission; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 6634) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 6635) granting an increase of pension to Stewart Gorton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6636) granting a pension to Jeanette L. Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6637) granting an increase of pension to W. W. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 6638) granting a pension to Frank H. Henderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6639) granting a pension to Emma E. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6640) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6641) granting a pension to Martha L. Sternberg; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6642) granting a pension to Frank Bachmeyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6643) granting a pension to John Gibbert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 6644) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6645) for the relief of Ivor Christensen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6646) for the relief of the American Fire Insurance Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 6647) granting an honorable discharge to William Devlin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6648) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Board; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 6649) granting an increase of pension to Hilery A. McVicker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 6650) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 6651) providing for the payment for certain services arising under the Navy Department; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 6652) granting an increase of pension to Penelope L. Newman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 6653) granting a pension to Seymour E. Ball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6654) granting a pension to Joseph R. N. Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6655) granting a pension to Margaret C. Darling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6656) granting a pension to Henry Parker Perley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6657) granting a pension to Belle Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6658) granting a pension to John R. Garstang; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6659) granting an increase of pension to James W. Warfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6660) granting an increase of pension to Chris Schneider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6661) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia M. Pence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6662) granting an increase of pension to William A. Burr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6663) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Bangs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6664) granting an increase of pension to Howard G. Cleveland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6665) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Sylvester Stanford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6666) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George W. Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6667) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John M. Beal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6668) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Robert E. Blair; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6669) for the relief of the State Mutual Building & Loan Association, of Los Angeles, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6670) for the relief of the Pasadena Building & Loan Association, of Pasadena, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6671) for the relief of the Home Builders' Loan Association, of Pomona, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 6672) granting a pension to Teresa O'Brien; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6673) granting a pension to Elizabeth Dailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6674) granting a pension to William W. Poor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6675) granting an increase of pension to Emeline C. Farrar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6676) granting an increase of pension to Olin Deeren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 6677) granting a pension to Violet Dauphin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6678) granting a pension to Eliza J. Griffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6679) granting an increase of pension to Stephen N. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6680) granting an increase of pension to Henry Neeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6681) granting an increase of pension to Addison Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6682) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6683) granting a pension to William O. Trammell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 6684) granting a pension to Fannie Baird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 6685) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia Mathews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6686) granting a pension to Mary M. Varble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6687) granting a pension to William P. Cloud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6688) granting a pension to Green B. Cloud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6689) granting an increase of pension to Isaac F. Greene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6690) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust the accounts of the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6691) for the relief of the Third Savings & Loan Co., of Piqua, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 6692) granting a pension to Walter C. Hathaway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6693) granting a pension to Ubert C. Ricker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6694) granting an increase of pension to Worley H. Stepp; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 6695) granting an increase of pension to Charles Leonard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 6696) granting a pension to Lucy B. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6697) granting a pension to Susan J. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6698) granting a pension to Emma Hiles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6699) granting a pension to Lydia A. Hibbard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6700) granting a pension to Tabitha E. Goodrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6701) granting a pension to Orinda Sarah Foust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6702) granting an increase of pension to Warden J. Wilkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6703) granting an increase of pension to George White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6704) granting an increase of pension to Edgar W. Thornton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6705) granting an increase of pension to William Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6706) granting an increase of pension to Andrew W. Sponsler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6707) granting an increase of pension to Casper Snider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6708) granting an increase of pension to William McKenney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6709) granting an increase of pension to Michael Killeen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6710) granting an increase of pension to David Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6711) granting an increase of pension to Harlan Hadley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6712) granting an increase of pension to David L. Hackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6713) granting an increase of pension to John W. Grewell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6714) granting an increase of pension to Francis Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6715) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Freely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6716) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Dunlap; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6717) granting an increase of pension to William H. Crane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6718) granting an increase of pension to William Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6719) granting an increase of pension to Frank Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6720) granting an increase of pension to George Blevins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6721) granting an increase of pension to Caroline E. Beck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6722) granting a pension to Cyrenous Dalley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6723) granting a pension to George Zederbaum; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 6724) granting a pension to Pauline Short; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6725) granting a pension to Julia Bartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6726) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6727) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel the allotment of Irene Lydia Simmons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STOUT: A bill (H. R. 6728) granting an increase of pension to William Horrigan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6729) for the relief of F. A. Carnal and R. X. Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 6730) granting a pension to Charles Vermillion; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6731) granting an increase of pension to Ida B. McCrea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT: A bill (H. R. 6732) for the relief of Joseph A. Jennings; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 6733) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Eleazer L. Sarsons; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 6734) for the relief of the Shreveport Mutual Building Association; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 6735) granting a pension to Mag Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6736) granting a pension to Lucinda Sotherland; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6737) granting a pension to Bacchus Ledford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6738) granting a pension to William J. Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6739) granting a pension to Mary N. Nichols; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6740) granting a pension to James F. Morrissey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6741) granting an increase of pension to Heber Stoddard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 6742) granting an increase of pension to Hiram S. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 6743) granting a pension to Eleanor F. Papst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6744) granting a pension to Mary A. Faux; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6745) granting a pension to Mary Roundhill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESHNER: A bill (H. R. 6746) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Pealer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6747) granting an increase of pension to James J. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6748) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Langenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6749) granting an increase of pension to John C. Lloyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6750) granting an increase of pension to Charles Edward Rohrbach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6751) granting a pension to Hattie G. Parnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6752) granting a pension to Laurence Kidd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6753) for the relief of Robert A. Malloy; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6754) for the relief of the legal heirs of A. R. Holzheid; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6755) for the relief of John Rothchild & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6756) for the relief of the Wilmerding-Loewe Co., of San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6757) for the relief of the American Bisquit Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6758) for the relief of the legal heirs of Hector M. McDonald, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6759) for the relief of Mary Jordan, widow of Dennis Jordan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6760) for the relief of Piper, Aden, Goodall Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6761) for the relief of H. Liebes & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6762) for the relief of the estate of Julius Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6763) for the relief of Richard H. Grey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6764) for the relief of the estate of Rudolf Axman, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6765) to reimburse the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, for moneys paid by said city and county to various persons upon judgment claims recovered by them against said city and county for damages inflicted to their property by soldiers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6766) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue a certificate of discharge in the true name of Herbert Horrell Webster, who enlisted in the Army under the name of Herbert Horrell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6767) for the relief of William H. C. Bowen, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6768) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Ormond M. Lissak; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6769) for the relief of Bernard Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6770) for the relief of Ellen B. Monahan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6771) for the relief of Albert Edgerton Buckman and others; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6772) for the relief of W. P. Fuller & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6773) for the relief of Edward Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6774) providing for the payment of additional per diems to certain witnesses in the case of *The United States v. A. L. Wisner & Co.*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Resolution (H. Res. 67) referring to the Court of Claims House bill 5834, and accompanying papers, for the relief of Peter Carroll and others; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Society of Friends of Purcell, Mo., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Memorial of Conference of Appraisers of United States Custom Service, favoring placing all assistant appraisers under the classified civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 3759, granting an increase of pension to Jacob Skiles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of retail merchants of Newark, Ohio, in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: Papers to accompany House bill 6140, for the relief of Theodore Copenhaver; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURKE: Affidavits in support of House bill 3794, for the relief of Thomas S. Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, memorial of Robert G. Doole Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, in favor of pensioning widows and minor children of honorably discharged soldiers who served in the Spanish War, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petition of citizens of the United States, favoring publication of the report of the Industrial Relations Committee; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of C. C. Clemons Produce Co., Kansas City, Mo., protesting against 1-cent tax on bills of lading, telephone messages, and telegrams; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Papers to accompany House bill 5009, granting a pension to Sabrina A. Broadfoot; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of executive committee Borough of Brooklyn, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of New York, favoring bill to pension widows and orphans of Spanish veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of San Diego County, Cal., favoring location at San Diego of Army and Navy bases on southern California coast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of companies of the Army and Navy Medal Honor Legion of the United States of America, favoring adequate national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Percheron Society of America, relative to reimbursement for herds of stock destroyed by the Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of American Saddle Horse Breeders' Association, protesting against the Government's interference with the breeding of horses for Cavalry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of 177 citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring bill to prohibit sale and export of arms, etc., by the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Western States Water Power Conference, of Portland, Oreg., opposing ownership by the United States Government of intrastate public utilities; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of Empire State Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, of New York, in favor of preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of board of directors of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, in favor of an investigation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the compensation paid the railroads by the Post Office Department for transportation of the mails; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of American Manufactures Export Association of New York, urging the upbuilding of the American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of Young Women's Christian Association, of Brooklyn, N. Y., in favor of amending the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States, in favor of eliminating schedule B from the emergency revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Independent Retail Merchants of New York, endorsing the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of American Neutrality and Peace Convention, in favor of an embargo on arms and ammunition; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of United States Navy League, in favor of establishing a council of national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany House bill 5014, granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Mason, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Retail Merchants' Association, Ottawa, Ill., favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GARRETT: Petition of citizens of Mason Hall, Tenn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARNER: Petition of citizens of the State of Texas, protesting against military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of Bartenders' Union of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against any additional tax being placed on liquor and beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrances of John G. Walter and 755 other citizens of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, against any additional increase of special taxes now imposed upon the brewery and liquor industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of the Howe-Allen Co., of Denver, Colo., relative to adjustment of impost duties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Evidence in support of House bill 5149, granting a pension to Nancy E. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Petition of Trenton Presbyterian Church, favoring establishment of a Federal motion-picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Woman's Missionary Union of Trenton, in favor of Federal censorship of motion pictures and for amendment of Philippine bill prohibiting sale of intoxicating drugs and drinks; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Third Presbyterian Church of Trenton, endorsing bill to establish Federal censorship of motion pictures in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Mary E. Rose and others, favoring Federal censorship of motion pictures in interstate commerce and bill prohibiting sale of liquor in the Philippines except for medicine; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Annie T. Bailey and others, in favor of an amendment to the Philippine bill prohibiting the sale of intoxicating drinks and drugs except for medicine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Missionary Society of the Fifth Presbyterian Church, of Trenton, favoring passage of bill for a national censorship in moving pictures; also a clause in the Philippine independence bill prohibiting use of liquor except for medical purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. KETTNER: Memorial adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, Cal., that Army post and Navy base be established at San Diego, Cal.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LIEBEL: Papers to accompany House bill 6261, granting an increase of pension to Frank L. Weiss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: Papers to accompany House bill 6274, granting an increase of pension to Samuel Sigman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Evidence in support of House bill 4365, granting a pension to Edward H. Hooven; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence supporting a bill (H. R. 4378) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence supporting a bill (H. R. 4378) to correct the military record of George Andrews; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, evidence supporting a bill (H. R. 4374) granting an increase of pension to William D. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence supporting a bill (H. R. 4367) granting a pension to Susanna Hodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence supporting a bill (H. R. 4371) granting a pension to Sarah B. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence supporting a bill (H. R. 4375) granting an increase of pension to Margaret I. Reider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence supporting a bill (H. R. 4369) granting a pension to Mary E. Paulus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence supporting a bill (H. R. 4377) granting an increase of pension to Barney Simmers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence supporting a bill (H. R. 4366) granting a pension to John D. Vine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence supporting a bill (H. R. 4376) granting an increase of pension to John J. Wolff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence supporting a bill (H. R. 4368) granting a pension to A. E. Simmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence supporting a bill (H. R. 4370) granting a pension to Sylvius Garver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence supporting a bill (H. R. 4372) granting an increase of pension to Mathias Boberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of monthly meeting of Friends at Philadelphia, opposing military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY: Papers filed in support of bill for the relief of Hillery A. McVichen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 6309) to pension Everett L. Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of bill (H. R. 6310) to pension William P. La Croix; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of MacGreevey-Sleight-DeGraff Co., favoring the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Dr. E. H. Hutton, favoring a more adequate national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of F. E. Andrews, favoring a better national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of William A. Comstock and others, of Alpena, for appropriation to protect the mouth of Thunder Bay River to insure unobstructed navigation in the harbor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of members of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Washington, D. C., favoring the Mann bill for the creation of a permanent tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Michigan Implement and Vehicle Dealers' Association, Vicksburg, in support of the Mann bill (H. R. 4723) for a tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Spanish War veterans of Coldwater, Mich., and T. J. Mead, Battle Creek, favoring legislation granting pensions to widows and orphans of soldiers, sailors, and marines who served during the War with Spain and the Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Tariff Commission League, Chicago, Ill., in support of the Mann bill (H. R. 4723) for a tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Louis Prince and members of the Cigar-makers' Union, No. 205, of Battle Creek, against increasing the tax on cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALBOTT: Petition of Synod of Baltimore, favoring censorship of motion-picture films in the District of Columbia and the Territories; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Synod of Baltimore, protesting against the exportation of rum and other intoxicants to Africa; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Synod of Baltimore, for adoption of a Sunday law for the District of Columbia equal to the best of the State Sunday laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Synod of Baltimore, favoring national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania (by request): Petition of Sons of the Revolution, State of New York, for increase of armament; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, asking for appropriation for reunion in the Vicksburg National Military Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also (by request), petition of Monthly Meeting of Friends, in Philadelphia, against increase of armaments in United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 4, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we bless Thee that Thou hast brought us in safety and peace and honor to the beginning of a new year. Through the most tragic year of the world's history Thou hast brought us safely. No promise of Thine has been forgotten; no plan of the Divine mind has been changed. Thy Word standeth sure.

We bless Thee that Thou hast kept alive the conscience of the world, and that no expedient of peril, no change of circumstance has been enabled to drown the simple appeal of humanity. We thank Thee that Thou hast quickened the sympathies of the world bound together by universal ties of pain. Thou hast brought us in sight of the larger and nobler vision of a united brotherhood of the race. Carry on Thy great plan for the accomplishment of the Divine will. We ask for Jesus' sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 17, 1915, was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, my colleague, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], a Senator elect who has not yet been sworn in, is present. I should like to have him sworn in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator elect from South Carolina will advance to the desk and take the oath of office.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. TILLMAN, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him.

PROPOSED INLAND WATERWAY (S. DOC. NO. 230).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 10, 1915, a report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors relative to the time, work, and expenditures necessary to the completion of an inland waterway beginning with New York Bay and ending with the Gulf of Mexico, etc., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

BROOKLYN NAVY YARD (S. DOC. NO. 229).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, calling attention to the serious condition existing at the navy yard, Brooklyn, N. Y., in so far as pertains to the depth of the water in ship channels leading thereto, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PUBLIC LANDS (H. DOC. NO. 466).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on land withdrawals from settlement, location, sale, or entry under the provisions of the act approved June 25, 1910, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented resolutions adopted by the House of Delegates of Porto Rico, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide Porto Rico with an organic act establishing a more republican form of government, which were referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF DELEGATES, PORTO RICO.

To the President and Congress of the United States:

As resolved by the House of Delegates of Porto Rico, I have the honor to place before the President and the Congress of the United

States the following resolution passed by the house at its session of March 9, 1915:

"House resolution requesting the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a democratic government in the island.

"Whereas the people of Porto Rico have fully shown their capacity for self-government:

"Whereas the subsistence for a longer period of the provisional government created by the Foraker Act is intolerable and it is of strict justice that Congress should substitute our present form of government, wherein the executive power pertaining to the heads of departments as such is confounded with the legislative power which they exercise as members, by virtue of law, of the upper house for a system essentially democratic: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Porto Rico, To request of the President and the Congress of the United States:

"That it provide Porto Rico with an organic act constituting in the island a republican form of government in harmony with the democratic traditions of the people of the United States and the culture and progress of the people of Porto Rico, the same to be on the following bases:

"(a) Establishment in the constitution of Porto Rico of the constitutional restrictions of section 10, Article I, of the Constitution of the United States, and amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13, and 15 of said Constitution.

"(b) Two legislative houses wholly elective.

"(c) Veto of the governor as it exists at present.

"(d) The power of the insular legislature in all local matters.

"(e) Exclusive jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Porto Rico or of any of the judges thereof on delegation of the court in all matters within the jurisdiction of district and circuit courts of the United States.

"(f) Provision that all appropriation and revenue acts shall originate in the lower house.

"(g) The cession to Porto Rico of its customs receipts and the non-application to the island of the internal-revenue laws of the United States.

"(h) Granting of franchises and privileges by the insular senate with the approval of the governor or by a commission designated in the following manner: Three members of the lower house, the minority to be represented; three members of the upper house, the minority also to be represented; and three heads of departments designated by the governor.

"(i) Appointments of the heads of departments by the governor, with the approval of the insular senate, for a term of four years.

"(j) Incompatibility of legislative duties with incumbence of any other remunerative office, or of an office wherein jurisdiction is exercised, members of both houses to be prohibited from accepting any remunerative office during the term for which they may have been elected.

"(k) Restriction of public credit in accordance with the assessed valuation of taxable property.

"(l) Persons who are not bona fide residents of the island to be prohibited from holding public office."

As speaker of the house and simple executor of the resolutions thereof, I should not comment on the foregoing resolution, but, to give the contents of the same greater force, I will state that it was passed by all the delegates representing the political parties. "Unión de Puerto Rico" and "Partido Republicano," who obtained the largest number of votes at the last general elections, and who compose almost the whole of Porto Rican opinion. I must also state that the only delegate who voted against said resolution declared that he belonged to neither of the parties having representation in the house of delegates.

Very respectfully,

JOSÉ DIEGO,

Speaker of the House of Delegates of Porto Rico.

SAN JUAN, P. R., December 10, 1915.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, Hawaii, praying for the enactment of legislation providing military training for all citizens, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, Hawaii, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the creation of a permanent body of tariff experts, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FLETCHER. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of Florida, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted by the Legislature of Florida June 1, 1915.

Concurrent resolution relating to holding of an exposition in the city of Pensacola to celebrate the cession of Florida by Spain to the United States.

Whereas the territory comprising the State of Florida was purchased by the United States in the year 1819; and

Whereas said purchase was ratified in the year 1821; and

Whereas the blessings, prosperity, and happiness accruing to said territory, its inhabitants, their descendants, and to the many people now inhabiting the State of Florida are cause for the most profound gratitude and thanksgiving; and

Whereas the immeasurable value, captivating beauty, the extraordinary healthfulness, and the exquisite climate of Florida are unknown and unappreciated by the millions who have never enjoyed its hospitality; and

Whereas the city of Pensacola and its vicinity was the scene of the greatest events which led to the cession of Florida by Spain to the United States; and

Whereas the first American government in Florida was established at Pensacola by the heroism and patriotism of the great soldier and Democratic statesman, Andrew Jackson; and

Whereas the first legislative council for the Territory of Florida was held at Pensacola and the first statutory laws of Florida were enacted at Pensacola in 1822; and